

ABSTRACT OF EVIDENCE

9383

RECORDED BY THE

RAILWAY POLICE COMMITTEE

1921



CALCUTTA:
SUPERINTENDENT GOVERNMENT PRINTING, INDIA

1922

ABSTRACT OF EVIDENCE

RECORDED BY THE

RAILWAY POLICE COMMITTEE

1921



CALCUTTA:
SUPERINTENDENT GOVERNMENT PRINTING, INDIA
1922

NOTE

The Committee issued three *questionnaires* : (1) for railway police officers, (2) for railway officers, and (3) for commercial associations, members of the public, etc. The evidence has been reproduced in this order. For convenience of reference, the evidence of all the witnesses in each class on each question has been collected under that question. The evidence of police officers has been arranged according to the province or administration to which they belong, and that of railway officers according to the railway administration under which they are employed, while that of commercial associations, members of the public, etc., has been arranged according to the towns or provinces with which they are mainly connected.

For further convenience of reference, the page at which the evidence under each question will be found has been noted in the *questionnaires* which have been reproduced in full at the commencement of the volume. A small subject index has also been prepared and will be found at the end of the volume.

Questions to be answered by Railway Police Officers.

1. Do you consider that the system of having the Watch and Ward establishment under the Traffic Department works satisfactorily? If not, what are the defects and what remedies would you suggest? Do you consider any improvement in the class of men enlisted desirable? (Page 1.)

2. What is the system—

- (a) of checking goods at time of loading, unloading and transshipment;
- (b) of supervising the staff employed in handling goods;
- (c) of fastening and sealing wagons;
- (d) of seal checking, and;
- (e) of guarding loaded wagons in yards and on running trains.

Do you consider the systems in force satisfactory? (Page 9.)

3. Are the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transshipment sheds satisfactory? (Page 17.)

4. Are pilferage or thefts from:—

- (a) goods sheds of goods booked or unbooked;
- (b) transshipment yards;
- (c) goods trains; and
- (d) passenger trains (luggage booked or unbooked) frequent on the length of railway in your charge and do the railway police take any cognizance of such cases, or measures to prevent such losses? If not, do you consider that they should do so? (Page 20.)

5. Are pilferages from consignments of particular classes of goods:—(a) arms and ammunition, (b) fresh fruit, (c) liquor, (d) fish—numerous on the length of railway in your charge?

What special arrangements are made for the protection of such consignments? (Page 24.)

6. Are reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons made to the railway police for enquiry?

What is the system in force with regard to the registration and investigation of such cases? (Page 28.)

7. How far is such pilferage, as takes place, due to the act or connivance of the railway staff? (Page 34.)

8. Are cases of shortages from wagons with broken seals registered and investigated as thefts immediately on report being made? (Page 36.)

9. What are the arrangements in force regarding seal checking? What is the strength of the special force (if any) told off for this duty, and is it carried out at all stations and out-posts where there are railway police or only at the boundaries of jurisdictions? (Page 38.)

10. Are railway police sent out at night with goods trains for the purpose of Watch and Ward? If so, please furnish brief particulars of the arrangements so made. If not, what measures are taken to prevent thefts from goods trains? (Page 41.)

11. Are head constables and constables deputed as train guards with all night trains for the protection of passengers and their property? If so, what is the system in force? How many men are employed and for how many hours are they so employed? Is the system effective? (Page 44.)

12. Are such guards deputed with day trains? (Page 48.)

13. Are cases of forged currency notes received at stations or in cash offices, registered by the railway police? If not, how are such cases dealt with? (Page 49.)

14. Is there much unreported loss or crime? If so, why are reports not made? (Page 50.)

15. Is railway crime mostly the work of local thieves? Where do most offences occur as regards (a) passengers and their luggage, (b) goods (e.g., in stations, at goods sheds, etc.)? (Page 54.)

16. Is there any want of co-operation between the railway and the district police in British India or in Native States? (Page 57.)

17. Can you instance any cases of malpractices on the part of railway and police subordinates which have come under your own immediate observations, and can you suggest any measures for checking such malpractices? (Page 64.)

18. Under what rules and by whose orders are members of the Railway Police Force at present recruited, transferred, promoted, etc., and do you consider that the system requires alteration? Is the quality of the officers and men satisfactory? (Page 67.)

19. Is service in the railway police popular? Is the *personnel* interchangeable with that of the district police? (Page 72.)
20. Are there complaints of too frequent transfers of gazetted officers? (Page 77.)
21. Have you a system of fixed travelling allowance? If not, are you in favour of such a system for officers and men? (Page 78.)
22. Are quarters provided for officers and men? (Page 80.)
23. Is life in the railway police service regarded as unhealthy? (Page 82.)
24. Are punishments or rewards more frequent than in the district police? (Page 84.)
25. Are you of opinion that the present allocation, strength and working of the police are satisfactory? In what particulars, if any, are alterations required? (Page 85.)
26. What railway police reserve is there, and have you any proposals to make regarding the sufficiency or allocation of the police reserves on the railway or railways with which you are connected? (Page 90.)
27. Is there any want of co-operation between the members of the railway staff and the railway police, and are you aware of any ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments? (Page 98.)
28. Is any more effective system of *liaison* possible, *e.g.*, by deputing railway officers to the railway police and police officers to the railway temporarily or by employing police officers permanently in the claims branch? (Page 99.)
29. What are the principal difficulties encountered in railway police investigations? What have you to suggest for their removal? In particular have you reason to complain of (1) delay in reporting, (2) difficulties due to reference to other jurisdictions, (*e.g.*, district police or railway police of another division or province) or to railway authorities? (Page 102.)
30. What are the rules regarding the investigation of cases occurring within railway limits and providing for the co-operation of the district police in the investigation of such cases? Are these rules satisfactory? (Page 110.)
31. What is the present rule defining the limits of railway police jurisdiction and do you consider it satisfactory? (Page 113.)
32. Have you any system for the special training of railway police officers and men? Do you think such a system is likely to give useful results? (Page 117.)
33. Have you a special detective staff? If so, describe its organisation? Do you consider this system likely to improve detection? (Page 119.)
34. What are the arrangements in force for the prosecution of railway cases? Are they satisfactory? (Page 124.)
35. The railway police are at present organised on a provincial basis. Would any other system of organisation in your opinion be an improvement on this, *e.g.*, (a) imperialisation, (b) an organization which would take the railway system as the unit and make the Superintendent of Police for most purposes the Head of a Railway Department, (c) a system under which the railway police were amalgamated with the district police. (Page 127.)
36. Are the railway police liable to be called on to provide special guards in times of unrest, strikes, etc.? If so, can such arrangements be made without interfering prejudicially with the general work of the railway police? (Page 138.)
37. How are the Superintendents' charges distributed in your province? (Page 140.)
38. Have you any further suggestions to make on matters germane to the present enquiry? (Page 141.)

Questions for Railway Officers.

1. How are the members of the Watch and Ward establishment appointed and supervised? (Page 147.)
2. From what castes are the men drawn, and is any enquiry as to character made before appointment? (Page 150.)
3. Is an improvement in the class of men enlisted desirable? (Page 153.)
4. Do you consider that the system of having the Watch and Ward establishment under the Traffic Department works satisfactorily? If not, what are the defects and what remedies would you suggest? (Page 156.)
5. What is the system :
 - (a) of checking goods at time of loading, unloading and transhipment ;
 - (b) of supervising the staff employed in handling goods ;
 - (c) of fastening and sealing wagons ;
 - (d) of seal checking, and
 - (e) of guarding loaded wagons in yards and on running trains.

Do you consider the systems in force satisfactory? (Page 164.)

6. Are the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transhipment sheds satisfactory? (Page 175.)

7. Are pilferages or thefts from:

- (a) goods sheds of goods booked or unbooked;
- (b) transhipment yards;
- (c) goods trains, and
- (d) passenger trains (luggage booked or unbooked) frequent on your railway, and do the Railway Police take any cognizance of such cases, or measures to prevent such losses? If not, do you consider that they should do so? (Page 179.)

8. Are pilferages from consignments of particular classes of goods (a) arms and ammunition, (b) fresh fruit, (c) liquor, (d) fish, numerous on your railway? What if any special arrangements are made for the protection of such consignments? (Page 189.)

9. Are reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons made to the railway police for enquiry? If not, how are such cases dealt with, and what is the system of investigation in cases investigated by the railway authorities? What are the main difficulties encountered? (Page 195.)

10. What is the difference between the arrangements made for the safety of:—

- (a) goods at owner's risk, and
- (b) goods carried at railway risk? (Page 202.)

11. How far is such pilferage as takes place due to the act or connivance of the railway staff? (Page 204.)

12. Is there any want of co-operation between different departments of the same railway or between different railways in regard to claims? (Page 208.)

13. Are you of opinion that the present allocation, strength and working of the police on your railway are satisfactory? In what particulars, if any, are alterations required, in your opinion? (Page 212.)

14. Is there any want of co-operation between the members of the railway staff and the railway police, and are you aware of any ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments? (Page 221.)

15. Is any more effective system of *liaison* possible, *e.g.*, by deputing railway officers to the railway police and police officers to the railway temporarily or by the employment of police officers in the claims branch of the Traffic Department? (Page 226.)

16. Is any system of rewards in force in the Claims Department, *e.g.*, are rewards given for recovery of goods:—

- (a) in proportion to the value of goods recovered;
- (b) out of the sums set apart by the railway administration to cover claims,
- (c) out of fines? (Page 230.)

17. Are fines imposed as punishments by the railway authorities in cases where negligence or connivance in regard to losses is proved or suspected? (Page 231.)

18. Is there much unreported loss or crime? If so, why are reports not made? (Page 233.)

19. The Railway Police are at present organised on a provincial basis. Would any other system of organization, in your opinion be an improvement on this, *e.g.*, (a) imperialisation, (b) an organization which would take the railway system as the unit and make the Superintendent of Police for most purposes the Head of a Railway Department; (c) a system under which the Railway Police would be amalgamated with the District Police. (Page 236.)

20. Can you give any instances of malpractices on the part of railway or police subordinates which have come under your own immediate observation? and can you suggest any measures for checking such malpractices? (Page 245.)

21. Have you any suggestions to make on any other points germane to the enquiry? (Page 248.)

Questions to be answered by Trades Associations, members of the public, etc.

1. What is the number of members of your Association? (Page 253.)

2. Are the members firms or individual members of firm? (Page 253.)

3. In what classes of consignments are the members mainly interested? (Page 253.)

4. In what classes of consignments are complaints of pilferage, theft or shortage most common? and on what Railway? (Page 256.)

5. Are these consignments mainly sent (1) by passenger train or goods train, (2) at Railway risk or owner's risk? (Page 259.)

6. Are complaints increasing in number? If so, can any explanation be given? (Page 263.)

7. If complaints are common, have you any suggestions as to the measures which should be adopted to give greater security? (Page 268.)

8. Do you consider that goods stations are adequately lighted and fenced? (Page 475.)

9. At what stage do you suspect that pilferages, etc., are generally made? (Page 277.)

10. Do you send your own men to book the consignments, see them into the wagon, and take delivery? (Page 282.)

11. Have you any complaints about specific malpractices, *e. g.*, pressure brought to give clear receipt without examination of goods, etc.? (Page 285.)

12. Have you any suggestions to make about the arrangements for the safety of passengers? (Page 289.)

13. Do you consider that the treatment and investigation of claims is satisfactory? Is there any special complaint as to particular classes of claims? Are claims promptly dealt with? (Page 292.)

14. Have you any suggestions to make for the improvement of the methods of dealing with claims? (Page 299.)

15. Have you any other suggestions to make germane to the inquiry? (Page 302.)

ABSTRACT OF EVIDENCE

RECORDED BY THE

RAILWAY POLICE COMMITTEE

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED BY RAILWAY POLICE OFFICERS.

Question No. 1.—Do you consider that the system of having the Watch and Ward establishment under the Traffic Department works satisfactorily? If not, what are the defects and what remedies would you suggest? Do you consider any improvement in the class of men enlisted desirable.

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, was of opinion that there should be a separate Railway Department for Watch and Ward under a superior officer, with travelling Inspectors and Jemadars. Appointments, punishment and general control should be in his hands. The existing arrangement on most railways was very unsatisfactory. There were many complaints that members of the Watch and Ward were commonly utilised for other duties. As far as possible, military pensioners should be employed. Improvement was chiefly a question of expense.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, considered that the Watch and Ward staff was undermanned and inadequately paid with the result that a great deal of pilferage was done by the staff. The lighting arrangements were inadequate even at stations like Moghal Serai, Allahabad, Cawnpore and Tundla, so that even with a larger staff, the protection of wagons could not be satisfactory. What was required was a strong staff, a better-paid staff and, if possible, a responsible official at their head. The department ought to be under some responsible officer of the railway who should welcome suggestions from the head of the railway police.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, considered that in big yards the Watch and Ward should be under the railway. Pensioned sepoys were a satisfactory class but the majority of indigenous coolies were criminals. A special officer not below the rank of Assistant Traffic Superintendent should be solely in charge. It was impossible for station masters in large yards like those at Lucknow, Saharanpur, Moradabad and Moghal Serai to exercise any efficient supervision. It was difficult for the present low class chowkidar to make out his case against other members of the yard staff who were also subordinates of the station master. The station master was a transportation officer in the main and would not willingly entertain charges of theft against his staff. The watch and ward staff urgently needed an officer to fight their battles for them.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that the present staff was inefficient. Railway chowkidars were underpaid and were on duty for too many hours at night. *Ex-Jemadars* and *ex-Army* sepoys should be employed and should be under the supervision of a European Sergeant at large stations. The whole force should be under a gazetted officer belonging to the railway or railway police, preferably the latter.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, considered that there should be a separate department of the railway under the District Traffic Superintendent with separate Inspectors to supervise the Watch and Ward. He recommended the employment of Army pensioners.

Inspector Macleod suggested a separate department under the railway.

Inspector Murphy suggested that there should be a separate supervising staff controlled by the District Traffic Superintendent personally, or by one of his Assistants. The staff should have nothing to do with station masters. If the Watch and Ward establishment were transferred to the railway police, matters would not improve.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, was of opinion that the system was very unsatisfactory. No reliable supervision or control was exercised over the staff. Chowkidars

turned up late for duty and absented themselves with impunity. The distribution of duties was left to the station master's clerk, but an examination for instance at Moghal Serai would show that he merely maintained a list of chowkidars and did not arrange the duties at all. The Jemadar of the chowkidars did not distribute his force to the best possible account instead of 10 men in the yard only 2 would be found. The others would be in the station master's office, the parcels office and the luggage office. Thefts occurred frequently during the duty of particular chowkidars without their being taken to task. The Traffic Department which controlled the chowkidars had little knowledge of the numerous thefts reported and less interest in the matter, regarding it solely as an evil with which the Government Railway Police should deal. The efficiency of the latter was usually judged by their failure to deal successfully with yard thefts, but they had no control over the staff. The obvious remedy was to make over the Watch and Ward system *en bloc* to the Railway Police. Additional police should be appointed for the purpose. Failing this, a better class of chowkidars, *ex-military* men, should be appointed with better pay and prospects. Adequate lighting and fencing-in of yards was also an urgent necessity.

Inspector Farrant was of opinion that an inferior class of men was employed and that supervision was practically non-existent. He suggested that the Watch and Ward should be placed under the control of the Railway Police provided that the Railway Authorities made better fencing and lighting arrangements and that the pay of the staff was considerably increased. A superior class of man should be enlisted such as military or police pensioners.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi stated that the strength was insufficient and the class of men unsuitable. Gurkhas and retired sepoys or other Government servants of the same status should be appointed with better pay and prospects. Transfers should be made after every 12 months. The appointment of local men should be avoided. There should be a jemadar or daffadar over every 12 chowkidars and 1 Watch and Ward Inspector over the whole force. The Inspector's duty would be to maintain a register of attendance and to detail the duties of jemadars and the men under him and to see that they were carried out. Every big station should have 1 Inspector and small stations should be grouped under such an official. The duties of chowkidars and jemadars should not be more than 6 hours at a time. Railway Police Constables should not be entrusted with Watch and Ward duties. There was the danger of cases failing in court in the absence of witnesses independent of the Police. Courts placed more reliance on other witnesses than on the Police. The Police could make surprise visits when necessary, but the responsibility of watching the goods should remain with the Railway Department.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz considered that *ex-Army* sepoys or a good class of men of any community would be more reliable and useful than the present staff; but such men should not be kept at any station for more than a year.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shankar complained of lack of supervision over the Watch and Ward staff and stated that the arrangement of duties was invariably left in the hands of station masters' clerks who had no experience or aptitude for such work. The Watch and Ward establishment should either be placed under the Police or under a Non-Commissioned Army officer. The class of men recruited was also very inferior. Men who had served the best part of their lives elsewhere were enlisted. They were generally unreliable, and with the inadequate pay they received and the great amount of temptation that presented itself before them while doing their duty and their physical incapacity to defy thieves, they easily fell in with the local bad characters. To ensure good work it was necessary—(1) that they should be given a living wage, (2) that they should be enlisted from men of high caste and proper enquiry should be made regarding their character; and (3) a standard of height and chest measurement and medical examination should be insisted upon.

Bombay.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General of Police, thought that at the basis of the matter was the responsibility of the Railway Companies for the safety of the goods in their charge. The existing division of responsibilities between the Police and the Railway Companies represented by the classification "Crime and Order" and "Watch and Ward" was sound in principle and should be maintained. The duties included in these terms were set out in detail in paragraph 48 of the Report of the Railway Police Committee, 1907. It was not necessary to revise the definitions except in the case of guarding running goods trains. He suggested that the staff should be properly organised and a system of progressive pay instituted. A lower supervisory staff of Havildars and Jemadars and a higher supervisory staff of Inspectors should be appointed. Control should be removed from station masters and handed over entirely to the District Traffic Superintendent who would work through his staff of Inspectors. It should be a Railway service and the Police should have no control. Seal checking should be one of the duties of the reformed Watch and Ward staff. He thought that the guarding of goods while in motion was as much the duty of the Watch and Ward as was the guarding of them while lying in goods sheds.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, was of opinion that the Watch and Ward staff should be made independent of other departments and placed under a Superintendent attached to the Claims Department. The Watch and Ward staff would not be satisfactory until they were adequately paid, organised and supervised.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent of Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, said that it was unsatisfactory to have one agency to prevent and another to detect. There was no proper supervision of the Watch and Ward and he would unify control of Watch and Ward and Police. Station masters had too much to do to spare time for supervision.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Great Indian Peninsula and Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways, stated that the system of having the Watch and Ward establishment under the Traffic Department did not work satisfactorily. Men past work were enlisted, and no enquiry was made as to their antecedents with the result that in some cases *ex-convicts* were entertained. The Watch and Ward should be placed under Police supervision and better pay should be given. At present under the Traffic Department no notice was taken of Police reports. A reformed Watch and Ward might enquire into missing goods cases and report to the Superintendent of Police. An experienced Traffic Officer might be appointed Superintendent of the Watch and Ward.

Sub-Inspector Rege agreed with Mr. Austin's remarks.

Mr. Gunder, formerly Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Bombay Presidency and now Watch and Ward Superintendent, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that he did not think that the system was satisfactory. The principal defects were (1) the haphazard method of appointing watchmen without regard to their caste, age, physical or mental condition or character, (2) the entire absence of any efficient supervision over their work. The supervision exercised by the Traffic staff was practically *nil* due chiefly to the inability of the staff to spare time, besides attending to their other and more important duties. The Watch and Ward should be made a separate department of the Railway under a responsible head with assistants to supervise the work. A better class of men, preferably *ex-military* men, should be employed on a better wage and the staff should be provided with quarters and uniform. The hours of duty which at present were 12 at a stretch should be reduced. He had been appointed temporarily as Superintendent of the Watch and Ward on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, and was at present collecting material to submit proposals for its organization and working. A small beginning had been made by employing an Inspector and several Head Watchmen and Watchmen at Baroda marshalling yard with jurisdiction as far as Ahmedabad in the north and Bombay in the south. The results for the brief period that the system had been working had been encouraging, the number of thefts from wagons, chiefly in Baroda marshalling yard, having diminished. His idea was that there should be a sufficient number of watchmen at each station effectively to guard all the goods sheds, yards, platforms and wherever shunting and other handling of goods took place. He saw no objection to *chaukidars* of all departments being organized into one force for each railway. The class of men now obtained was not satisfactory. When there was a vacancy some one said that the applicant was his brother and he was appointed at once. No enquiry was made about his character. A sufficiently large number of *ex-military* men was now available. They had been accustomed to discipline and had more sense of responsibility than the ordinary *chaukidar*. At the same time he would not exclude local men altogether, because they were very useful, having a knowledge of the people and of the surrounding country. It was essential that the staff should be provided with quarters, otherwise there was sure to be discontent. At some stations where watchmen were included in the menial staff they were provided with quarters but a large number of them were not so provided and did not even live at the station where they were employed. The men would be liable to transfer. The lowest unit would vary according to the size of the yard and the location of the station and would depend on the length and number of stations intervening. A *duffadar* or *havildar* might be appointed to look after 10 or 15 stations or if they were unimportant, the number might be increased. There were *chaukidars* at most stations on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, but at many there were only one or two men. It would be necessary under the new scheme to arrange for the supervision of these men by travelling inspectors and *duffadars*. One feature of the new scheme had been to remove the control of the Watch and Ward from the hands of the station staff. The reasons that led to this change were that the station staff never paid any attention to the Watch and Ward nor were they able to do so. Station Masters' time was taken up in attending to business in the station and on the platform. They had not the time to go to the yard to see whether the watchmen were on the alert or whether they were present or not. *Chaukidars* were supposed to be on duty in the goods sheds and yards, but actually they went to a corner and went to sleep. The hours of duty were too long to expect any reasonable man to keep himself awake being from 6 o'clock in the evening to 6 o'clock in the morning. One man had to look after half a mile of yard where hundreds of wagons were being shunted up and down. It stood to reason that he could not effectively supervise all that was taking place during the shunting operations. Another reason for the change was the feeling that men would be better watchmen if removed from the control of the station staff, because the Indian Station Master utilized them on duty for which they were never intended, for instance, as house orderlies. One man was found serving as a *paniwala*. He had not heard any reason given that there would be less risk of their colluding with the station staff in regard to thefts and pilferages if removed from their control, but from his own personal experience he believed that there was a great deal of collusion between the station staff and *chaukidars* in regard to the proceeds of thefts. Station Masters got supplies of

things they generally used and when the chaukidars supplied them they enjoyed a certain amount of immunity from discipline. They looked after their own interests as well. With regard to the suggestion that if a well disciplined force were instituted it might be possible to cut down the staff, he thought that later some attempt might be made in that direction when things had improved, but he did not think that it would be possible in the beginning. On the contrary, it would be necessary to increase the staff. It would be necessary to put the men into uniform and to arm them with a weapon, say the *dharia* used in Gujerat which had a sort of bill hook at the end of a long stick. It was a very formidable weapon. The men must have something with which to defend themselves in the case of attack by armed men. In reply to a question whether it was proposed to enlist the men under any Act, he stated that there was no enactment under which the men could be enlisted but he thought it very desirable that there should be some sort of authority or power to arrest, and for superior officers, to make searches. The men of course had certain powers of arrest under the Railway Act, like any other Railway servant, but as regards the question of arresting men outside the jurisdiction of the Railway, they ought to be vested with some legal authority and made additional policemen under the Police Act. There was such a provision in the local Police Act. They should be given jurisdiction in the adjoining areas as it might be necessary to follow up cases and make inquiries and even make searches. They ought to have power to search without waiting for the local police. The headman of the village was very often the receiver of stolen property purloined from the railway. He was averse from rendering any assistance and would put all sorts of difficulties in the way of the railway investigating staff. Promptness was everything in an inquiry and these men should have the power of arrest and making searches. With regard to the suggestion that the provision in the Bombay City Police Act under which the Police were entitled to arrest a man who was in possession of property under suspicious circumstances (the onus of proving that he was innocent being on the man who was arrested) should be applied to the Railways he thought that the idea was excellent. It was intended that he should look after the whole of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India line, both metre gauge as well as broad gauge. The charge would be unwieldy for one man to supervise effectively and he thought that an assistant would be necessary. In the first instance he would ask for a Policeman because he was more accustomed to exercise supervision over disciplined men, but when the force was placed on a permanent footing he did not think that it should necessarily be officered by Policemen.

Ahmedabad.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, now Catering Superintendent, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway but formerly an Inspector in the Railway Police, was of opinion that the Watch and Ward should be done by the Police because under the present system those responsible for Watch and Ward lacked (i) the power to summon, (ii) the power to search. Detection was absolutely eliminated in these circumstances. He thought that appointments in the Watch and Ward should either be made pensionable or that the advantages of the Provident Fund should be extended to them so that some hold could be secured over the members. If the Watch and Ward were properly run the Railways could prevent crime but they would never be able to detect it. Every Traffic Inspector should be a police officer and he should have the power to search and to summon. He should work under the Superintendent of Police who would be entirely responsible for the Watch and Ward.

Mr. Lallubhai Hargovindas, Public Prosecutor, Godhra (Panch Mahals), mentioned that during 1929 he had been employed to prosecute many railway theft cases in the Panch Mahals, the value of property stolen totalling about 7 lacs, chiefly from consignments from the Egerton and Dhariwal Mills to Dohad and Jekot. They were all goods train thefts while the train was in motion. He was of opinion that in many of these cases the watchmen were concerned as they were in touch with the thieves in the surrounding villages. He did not agree that the increase in thefts was solely due to the rise in prices. He ascribed the increase a great deal to the notion held by the Police that their responsibility had ceased after the system of watch and ward by the Railway was instituted in 1911. The main thing was supervision and that they did not get now-a-days. Station Masters sat in their bungalows and never gave an eye to the watchmen.

Inspector Garside on special duty with the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway as Watch and Ward Inspector, stated that the Watch and Ward should be organised as a separate department under a railway officer. A European with Police experience should control the members of the Watch and Ward. His duty as Watch and Ward Inspector was to keep the whole Watch and Ward staff awake, which was most essential because most of the thieving that was going on was being done by railway servants in the larger yards and this had been going on simply because nobody had been keeping the Watch and Ward awake. The number of the Watch and Ward was insufficient at large stations. He had not arrived at any conclusion as to the criterion which should be adopted for fixing the strength of the Watch and Ward, which depended very largely on circumstances. One man was sufficient if alert, to guard both sides of wagons. The quality of the Watch and Ward was fairly satisfactory. He was enlisting *ex*-soldiers who had been demobilised, but not pensioners, as the latter were too old as a rule.

Madras.

None of the witnesses considered the system satisfactory. The main defects mentioned were :—(1) the right type of man was not appointed, (2) the supervision was inadequate.

Mr. Thomas, the Inspector-General, said that the head watchman was not a person of sufficient authority and, to have the station master as the executive head, was the worst possible arrangement. The station master did nothing whatever to stop pilferage. He had known a station master object to a suggestion from a policeman that he should do something to stop it. The general pay in Madras was Rs. 15 which was quite insufficient. An improvement in the class of men was necessary, the type of men employed in the Police being satisfactory. Greater scrutiny regarding their antecedents was also necessary. The hours of work should be greatly curtailed. At present the average watchman worked from dusk till dawn. He thought that it would be advisable to place the watch and ward under Police control, something on the line of the arrangements existing in the Kolar Goldfields. There ought to be one European supervising officer.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, said that more responsibility for crime should be put on the Watch and Ward. The Police did not supervise them officially, but in practice they did when thefts were bad.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, suggested that if it were not possible to put the Police in control the Watch and Ward should be encouraged to have a greater sense of responsibility by granting them gratuities and extending to them the advantages of the General Provident Fund. The railways would probably raise objections as these suggestions if adopted would mean a great increase in expenditure. A third possibility would be to get a business man to take over the whole thing on contract. Enquiries into antecedents should be made through the Railway Police. He had known of cases in which the South Indian Railway had employed dismissed policemen as watchmen.

Inspector Doraisamy suggested that the Watch and Ward should be made to deposit a certain sum in advance. This system had been tried with success in the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway. Men of better physique and better sense and younger men were required. At present ordinary street coolies who were past work were recruited.

Inspector Krishnappa suggested shorter hours.

Bengal.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, stated that the system, as at present worked was far from satisfactory. Till quite recently the men were miserably paid. Their pay was increased lately but an incremental system should be introduced. The staff was undermanned, overworked and ill-organised. In Asansole and Bandel 25 and 33 per cent. of the men were convicted in specific cases of theft during 1920. He had to employ detectives and extra men for patrols before he could get things right at Asansole but had got good information by paying for it. At Asansole the yard was surrounded by a criminal population. A separate Watch and Ward Department should be created with an officer at its head immediately subordinate to the General Traffic Manager, with assistants at selected places on the line. The force should be organised on military or police lines with proper hours for duty and rest. There should be a reserve under a subordinate officer for duty at places where outbreaks of thefts occurred. The alternative was to place the duty of the Watch and Ward in the hands of the Police but he was not in favour of this idea.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, mentioned that the Watch and Ward jemadars who were *ex-sepoys* were too old. As the watchmen were drawn from the same class as the menials they were afraid to report them. There should be more *ex-soldiers*.

Inspector D. N. Mukherjee stated that a committee was appointed some time ago to enquire into the Watch and Ward system at Howrah. The members were all experienced subordinate officers of the railway and they were unanimous in condemning the organisation. In his opinion the best arrangement would be for the Police to take over the Watch and Ward duty and to do away with the present system. At present the Police were responsible for the detection of crime but the prevention was entrusted to a different organisation. From the Police point of view this arrangement was faulty. The Police did the Watch and Ward on the jetties of the Port Trust and thefts were less common there.

Inspector S. C. Banerjee said that the hours were too long and there should be an efficient supervising staff.

Assam.

The Assam Government was of opinion that the Watch and Ward should remain under the Railway Authorities.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that the question of Watch and Ward was considered by the Railway and Police authorities with special reference to Chittagong jetties between the years 1910 and 1912 when the Railway was altogether opposed to Police control except under conditions which would have nullified the advantages from the point of view of the Police Department. As regards the general question of Watch and Ward the Railway

would oppose any suggestion to replace their men by the Police under purely Police control. It would lead to difficulties, and perpetual quarrelling if the Watch and Ward at railway stations were done by Railway chowkidars under Police supervision. Special training of constable would also be necessary before it could be done with good results. It would then lead to the detection of malpractices on the part of railway subordinates as well as on the part of police themselves.

Inspector Syed Hashmatullah did not consider the system satisfactory. The number of the Watch and Ward should be increased and there should be an independent supervising officer. They should be enlisted from a better class of men and no miscellaneous duty such as fetching water, making purchases in the bazar, etc., should be imposed upon them.

Inspector Upendra Chandra Deb was of the same opinion.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Frechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that the system of having the Watch and Ward under the Traffic Department was satisfactory but the following defects existed:—(a) The number of chowkidars was too small to be of any practical use. (b) The chowkidars were poorly paid and were not given the benefits of the Provident Fund. (c) They were enlisted without any enquiry being made as to their character and past history. (d) There was no supervision. There should be a dafadar over every group of 10 chowkidars. Chowkidars should be eligible for promotion to the post of dafadar and men doing the work of dafadars should be given better posts in the Traffic Department. Better working would probably be obtained if the Watch and Ward were placed under the Police.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Kharagpur, did not consider that the system was satisfactory. The men employed were of low class and were ill-paid and had no training. They personally committed thefts of foodstuffs. Pensioned sepoys would probably be the best men to employ.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent of Police, considered the system satisfactory except for supervision. He suggested the appointment of a special staff for the purpose. Supervision and checks by station masters and goods clerks were nominal. Gurkhas and retired military men had proved a failure as chowkidars. He quoted his experience at Asansol where after a short time they became receivers. The present class was suitable if paid sufficiently and properly supervised. They should not be allowed to remain at one station for any length of time and should be severely punished for negligence and handsomely rewarded for good work.

Inspector Indar Sen Sachar did not consider that the present system was satisfactory for the following reasons:—(a) An unsatisfactory class of men was recruited. (b) Want of discipline and indefinite nature of duties. (c) Unlimited terms for which a chowkidar was posted at different stations. Transfers of chowkidars depended entirely on their ability to keep the establishment clerks in the office of the District Traffic Superintendent in a good humour. Owing to their position under the Station Master if the latter happened to be slack or dishonest, which was the rule rather than the exception he had to connive at what the chowkidars did to supplement their small pay. "It is an open secret that no chowkidar pays for his food but helps himself from the stock of booked and unbooked consignments in the goods shed which are in his charge." The Railway Police should not undertake the Watch and Ward of railway property as that system had been condemned, but each Railway District should have a Watch and Ward Department and chowkidars should be recruited in consultation with the Superintendent of Railway Police. A mixed class of men should be recruited, preferably *ex*-soldiers and Gurkhas. Chowkidars should not remain at stations for longer than a year. For every ten stations there should be a dafadar whose duty should be the supervision of the work of chowkidars. Above him there would be a Sergeant under orders of the District Traffic Superintendent, who would be responsible for the supervision of the Watch and Ward staff in his jurisdiction and would be constantly on tour. The railway authorities should either take the loan of an officer of the rank of Sub-Inspector of Police from the Police Department or at least appoint men of that status and qualification in the post. The Watch and Ward staff should not be under station masters. The number of chowkidars to be employed at a particular station should be fixed in consultation with the Superintendent of Police, and when traffic conditions demanded the District Traffic Superintendent should augment this number from a small reserve. The practice of station masters employing temporary local men in vacancies and reporting the matter to the District Traffic Superintendent for approval should be abolished.

Inspector Fouzdar Narain Kumar was not in favour of the present system, the defects being:—(1) Insufficient staff. (2) Nature of supervision. (3) Underhand practices. (4) Poor pay. (5) No verification of character. The force should be under the control of the Police for the sake of better discipline. Chowkidars should have a chance of rising to the post of dafadar, constable and even head-constable in the case of good work. If possible, *ex*-Army men should be recruited. At present there was no control over the working of chowkidars. If they went to sleep in the yard when supposed to be on duty there was nobody to take them to task. They imagined that their duty was simply to report to the station master on duty when they found any seal broken in the yard.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, did not consider that the system worked satisfactorily. The remedy was to enforce responsibility on the Traffic Department. Four-fifths of the crime reported arose from defective supervision. The pay of the upper subordinates of the Traffic Department was insufficient to keep them from temptation. Railway Companies paid enormous sums annually in compensation for goods lost or stolen and if a really substantial salary was given it would result in a corresponding decrease in compensatory expenditure, enormous saving of time and work and loss to merchants.

(1) *Messrs Hurst*, (2) *Mayberry*, (3) *Glacken*, (4) *Sharif Muhammad Khan*, (5) *Mazhar Nugi*, and (6) *Baj Nath Kaula*, all thought that the present system was unsatisfactory.

Defects specified were :—

- (a) Inadequate control (1), (3) and (4).
- (b) Lack of supervision (1), (4) and (5).
- (c) Poor quality—
 - (i) Old and feeble (4), (5).
 - (ii) Bad characters (4), (5).
 - (iii) Poor class (2), (3).
- (d) Men were local men and were kept too long in one place (5).
- (e) Hours were too long (5).

Suggestions mentioned were :—

- (a) Employ pensioners (3).
- (b) Put Watch and Ward under Police permanently (5) or temporarily (4).
- (c) Transfers of railway menials to be reported to Police (4).

Hyderabad (Deccan.)

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, thought that the system was not satisfactory because the persons often responsible for pilfering were either the immediate superiors or colleagues of the watchmen who were not sufficiently supervised. Their hours were too long; they were on duty for 12 hours at a stretch, *i.e.*, from 7 A.M. to 7 P.M. and from 7 P.M. to 7 A.M. No care was taken to see that the men on duty from 7 P.M. to 7 A.M. did not work on their own during the day and come to work in the evening to lie down and sleep. The strength of the Watch and Ward was not insufficient. It was the supervision that was bad. Watchmen should be placed under a gazetted officer of the Railway who should enlist and control them. This officer should be known as Superintendent of Watchmen and his head-quarters should be at the head-quarters of the Railway Police Superintendent so that they might confer and work together to prevent crime. He could have some men under him to inspect the watchmen. They could also enquire into cases of theft and shortage and help the railway considerably. Men of any class made watchmen but pensioned sepoys and policemen who had been subjected to discipline and sentry duty were preferable. Their hours should be from 12 noon to 12 midnight and 12 midnight to 12 noon. It was not the proper duty of the Police to do Watch and Ward work. (Mr. Crawford added that in Hyderabad the Watch and Ward duties were performed by the Railway Police.)

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, considered that the Watch and Ward establishment should be under the control of the Police. At present the actual supervision was most defective as the Traffic Department could not devote any time to it except at the cost of neglecting their proper duties. If the Watch and Ward were placed under the control of the Police they would be better supervised. The Police would also be in possession of the antecedents of the men and would maintain a permanent record regarding them. If the Traffic Department were unwilling to relinquish all control over the establishment, it should be possible to allow it to continue to enlist the men (the present class was satisfactory provided the Police had some power of *veto* in the case of men of bad character), to leave all supervision to the Police and to grant both departments joint powers of dismissal. If supervision was made over to the Police, it would be necessary to increase the strength of Head Constables and Sub-Inspectors. It would, however, be possible for the Railway Companies to organise their Watch and Ward as a regular service. The Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway had taken steps to do so. There would be no objection to the Watch and Ward being organised as separate branch of the Traffic Department with a gazetted officer at its head. Powers of supervision should be given to the Police together with authority to exclude men of bad character or to dismiss them with the concurrence of the Railway officer in charge of the department. This arrangement would not lead to friction but he would prefer that the Watch and Ward should be under the control of the Police. In the

case of the District Police the chowkidari establishment was under the District Superintendent of Police although it was controlled by the District Magistrate. People who had to watch and take care of property should be more or less under the control of the Police if they were to be expected to minimise losses or to prevent crimes.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent Railway Police, Karachi, was of opinion that the system was not satisfactory. The present arrangement for Watch and Ward which was done by the Traffic Department and practically unemployed men under Section 22B of the District Police Act, IV of 1890, which would ensure the enlistment of a suitable type of men, adequate control over them and prospects of promotion. The Railway would pay for the force but would have no voice in its control in the same way as private persons and firms, such as Ralli Brothers, obtained additional police which were controlled by the Police Department while the firms paid for services rendered. The present chowkidars were at the beck and call of station masters and others and did very little Watch and Ward. The chowkidars placed on guard over consignments were often so ignorant and in many cases so old that when questioned they could not give the number of packages placed under their charge. It would be possible to surmount the present difficulties by having a regularly organised Watch and Ward service on each railway if the chowkidar was not at the beck and call of station masters and others.

Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali, Inspector of Police, was of opinion that the system of having the Watch and Ward under the Traffic Department was not satisfactory. Chowkidars were employed on low pay, while their enlistment, discharge and dismissal were made on the recommendations and at the discretion of station masters, therefore they had to work in consultation with them. The men employed were useless. This work ought to be entrusted to the Police and men should be specially selected for the purpose. They should be made to understand that they would be rewarded by promotion for good work and that they would be held responsible for proper watch and ward.

Punjab.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General of Police, stated that the existing force of chowkidars at large centres should be replaced by regular police because the members of the latter force could be transferred from one duty to another and in that way could be prevented from forming cliques and gangs which could not be ensured with chowkidars who were residents of the locality. Where there was a police station with an Inspector and perhaps a Deputy Superintendent, control and supervision could be easily exercised over the Watch and Ward. He did not advocate such an arrangement in small places because the Watch and Ward would be thoroughly slack and there would be no discipline. Moreover thefts at small stations were comparatively easy to locate, at any rate, much easier than in big yards like Lahore, Delhi and Rawalpindi. Replacing the chowkidari staff at large stations by Railway Police goods in their charge. The men would be additional police and would be paid for by the railway. That arrangement would be better than the system of having a regular Watch and Ward service in the Railway with gazetted officers at the head, because even under such an arrangement the chowkidars could not be transferred whereas there were police buildings at every large station. The North-Western Railway did not provide quarters for their chowkidars.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, did not consider that the system was satisfactory, the chief defects being:—(a) Want of supervision, and (b) Poor quality of the staff. He would replace the Watch and Ward chowkidars by additional police under the Railway Police at large centres maintaining the present arrangement of chowkidars under the Traffic Department at minor stations only. Such an arrangement would entail extra expenditure for the Railway because the Police received pensions and were clothed and housed. They were also better paid than the chowkidars and they got leave. He had discussed the suggestion with the Agent and other Railway officials and he did not think that they were hostile to the proposal.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent of Police, did not consider the system satisfactory, the chief defects being (a) employment of incompetent hands, (b) want of supervision. He was of opinion that the Watch and Ward should be under the supervision of station house officers or that they should be replaced by additional police. His experience went to show that the goods clerks were hand in glove with the chowkidars and were implicated in pilferages. Another argument against the system was that the chowkidars did the work of private servants for the clerical staff. Furthermore, it was a common complaint in his jurisdiction that the Railway could not obtain sufficient chowkidars: for instance, 40 chowkidars were sanctioned for Rawalpindi but there were actually only 9 chowkidars on the roll. The Railway paid their Chowkidars Rs. 17 per mensem whereas the Police started on Rs. 17-8 and rose to Rs. 20. They also received extra Re. 1, as an allowance and Inspectors generally rose from constables. If the chowkidars were replaced by additional

Police the latter would realise that if they did good work they would secure promotion to higher posts. The present Watch and Ward could only do good work if kept under the control of station house officers.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir did not consider the system satisfactory, the principal defects being: (1) lack of competent hands, (2) the limited prospects of the staff, and (3) insufficient supervision. The chowkidars should be replaced by regular police working under the Central Investigation Agency. Railways did not secure competent hands for Watch and Ward duty. The men were often old and physically unfit, or at times men were taken who were invalided from other departments. The class wanted was men who could tackle thieves and who were powerful and armed. The members of the Watch and Ward had no prospects whereas if the work were done by the Police it would be done by men who had prospects of promotion.

North-West Frontier Province.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, was of opinion that the present system was not satisfactory and desired the Watch and Ward to be brought under the control of, and run entirely by, the Police.

Khan Sahib Rana Tulia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that the present system did not work satisfactorily. A large number of small pilferages and thefts occurred and serious cases also were committed occasionally, especially recently when prices all-round had been very high. These cases often remained unreported in spite of the force employed on Watch and Ward and even if reported could not be brought home to offenders for want of judicial evidence. The Watch and Ward should be paid for by the Railway but should be directly under the Railway Police. The work of the Police would undoubtedly be increased in dealing with them but results would justify the extra work entailed. Supervision by Police officers would be more effective. The members of the Watch and Ward should be as far as possible *ex-soldiers*, *ex-policemen* and other retired Government servants.

Question No. 2.—What is the system of—

- (a) checking goods at time of loading, unloading and transhipment ;
- (b) supervising the staff employed in handling goods ;
- (c) fastening and sealing wagons ;
- (d) seal-checking ; and
- (e) guarding loaded wagons in yards and on running trains.

Do you consider the systems in force satisfactory ?

United Provinces.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, referring to (a) and (b) mentioned that at present the goods clerk, who was supposed to supervise the handling of goods by *palladars*, had no time to watch them. Consignments were roughly checked, wagons were closed and on arrival at destination if a shortage was found, nobody knew where it had occurred, although the pilferage had actually been done before loading, and the bags packed so that the damage would not show at first glance. At Barabanki, the *palladars* were searched in 1917 after their day's work, and stolen grain was found on all of them, but the case was dropped for fear of a strike in war time. Station masters pocketed the money supplied to them by the Railway Company to pay the coolies, and allowed the coolies to loot. At some stations the coolies paid the station masters to be allowed to work in the goods shed. A wholetime man was required who should be well paid and have no other duties except checking and supervision. With regard to (c), he thought that the Railway should adopt some kind of lock. On the metre gauge portion of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, locks were used between Achnera and Cawnpore, and on the Bengal and North-Western Railway on goods trains running at night between Gonda and Unao. These measures had had a good effect. A system of soft iron rivets through the wedge cotters on the wagon doors as invented in North-Western Railway, Locomotive Department, would be effective. With regard to (d) he observed that crime could not be successfully investigated until localized. When a constable was put specially on the job at stations at the borders of police jurisdictions good results were obtained. The guard in the train got slack when expected to check his seals, possibly over 100, and neglected his duty.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, referring to (a) and (b), said that station masters underpaid the labour they employed. It was often admitted that they let them help themselves in order to eke out their pay. If the Police caught them trouble began. If they insisted there was a strike. He cited cases at Barabanki.

Inspector Macleod stated with reference to (c) that trucks that were loaded were not sealed at once, but were sealed along with others. The best course was that as soon as one wagon was loaded it should be sealed. Such a measure would check a good deal of pilferage. With regard to (d), there should be a special seal-checking staff under the Railway. At present seals were checked by the Watch and Ward who were no better at it than constables. Guards were supposed to check but did so perfunctorily.

Inspector Murphy referring to (c), mentioned that a wagon that was loaded at 12 o'clock in the day would not be sealed till about 6 or 7 wagons had been loaded, and then the sealing and fastening was not supervised by any of the goods staff. It was done by the man who was deputed as a sealsman, and theft took place at forwarding stations after wagons had been loaded and before they were sealed. With reference to (d), he stated that the Police put constables on duty for six hours at a time for the purpose of checking seals at the borders of jurisdictions simply to localise thefts. Constables were really not competent to check seals. Such men should know English. The present men could not make out a defective seal if, for instance, the cord was cut and knotted behind the label. The present practice was simply to make a hasty inspection on both sides of the train and get the register signed by the guard, who did not accompany the constable because he had no time to do so.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, referring to (d) stated that the systems in force were unsatisfactory having regard to the prevention of crime on railways and the enormous claims paid annually. The result of the joint check of seals by the Police and the Railway was farcical. Guards refused to make any check in the majority of cases, signing the seal-books in their brakevans when they were brought to them by the constable on duty. The latter following the bad example set them made no check, but merely counted the seals at the end of the platform as the train passed. Moreover they only concerned themselves with seals on the platform side, and did not check the off-side. "This important duty is more honoured in its breach than in its observance."

Inspector Farrant considered that the systems were not satisfactory and were capable of improvement. Referring to (c), he was of opinion that all wagon doors should be fitted with locks. He did not think that top fasteners were of much use. They were seldom used and were always out of order. He preferred tin shackles with lead seals to string for the reason that doors on hinges became loose and the string often broke. The objection put forward about the tin shackles that the label was more liable to get out of place, could be met by placing the label on the side of the wagon.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nubi was of opinion that the systems in force were far from satisfactory.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated that systems (a) and (b) were not satisfactory. Referring to (b) he stated that it was a fact that a large number of persons worked in the Benares Cantonment where he was posted without being paid. The men came in with the merchants who brought goods to be loaded and the station master took advantage of their presence to help his coolies.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shanker stated that the system of supervising the staff handling the goods (b), as well as that of checking seals (d), required much improvement. In big goods or transhipment sheds there should be Goods Supervisors whose exclusive duty should be the supervision of staff handling the goods and there should be a limited number of goods trains which should carry only sealed wagons, which should not be attached, as at present, promiscuously to any train.

Bombay.

(a) and (b). The witnesses stated that the system prevailing appeared to be that at large stations tranship clerks and loading foreman checked goods and supervised the staff handling the goods. Elsewhere loading clerks or tranship clerks did the work.

(c) There were permanent sealsmen at large stations; at small stations the sealing was done by any of the menial staff. The transhipment clerk or the loading clerk were also held responsible for this work.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that the sealing was rarely checked and was carelessly done. Lead seals were unsatisfactory because they could be easily opened unless properly pressed together with the punch supplied for this purpose. Twine and ordinary seals though easily tampered with could soon be detected.

(d) Number-takers were appointed at large stations.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that the staff could not work satisfactorily owing to want of time, length of train and paucity of numbers.

According to all the witnesses at least two number-takers were required for each side of the train. It was found that some seals were placed too high to be satisfactorily examined without the aid of a ladder and it was thought that these were invariably skipped.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that the police only did seal-checking as a special measure. *Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General*, thought that it might be made part of the duty of the railway police.

(c) Loaded wagons in yards were guarded by the Watch and Ward staff. Running trains were not guarded except as a special measure undertaken by the police.

Sub-Inspector Rege stated that he deputed 3 or 4 constables in mufti to patrol at night. Running train thieves tied up signals and then boarded trains. If the guard or driver said anything they stoned them. The police had shot a man at Thana and arrested three or four others. Since then there had been no thefts in that locality.

The whole system was reported to be unsatisfactory. Transhipment clerks and loading foremen could not, in the opinion of witnesses, check goods and supervise loading, handling, sealing, etc., in addition to their own duties. Separate officials were required.

Ahmedabad.

Mr. Lalubhai Hargobindas, Public Prosecutor, Godhra (Panch Mahal), referring to (c) stated that clerks generally took loading on trust.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, a former Inspector of Railway Police, was of opinion that locks were useless. "Have your wagons bare without foothold or handhold. Men can board a wagon now travelling at 20 miles an hour. There are not many such experts but generally one in every gang."

Madras.

(a) The witnesses stated that the checking was supposed to be done by the transhipment clerks. As a matter of fact it was generally done by their subordinates. In heavy stations clerks had no time to do the checking.

(b) This was generally left to the coolies.

(c) The wagons were sealed in the evening after the day's work was over. The witnesses were of opinion that the clerks responsible for the loading did not attend to the sealing. Wagons remained open and unsealed for hours.

(d) Seal-checking was done at all junction stations by railway watchmen and independently at all larger stations by the railway police with a view to localising offences.

(e) Loaded wagons in the yards were guarded by railway watchmen who were generally insufficient and inefficient. The responsibility lay on these men but the railway police also occasionally made informal arrangements to make the guard more effective.

The witnesses considered that the rules laid down were sufficiently clear and comprehensive but that the actual working left much to be desired. The police made an independent check of seals at large stations and also patrolled yards and protected running trains.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent of Railway Police, Trichinopoly, thought it was absolutely necessary that the police should check seals so as to enable them to localise theft. It did not cause friction with the railway but rather tended to keep them up to the mark.

Bengal.

(a) From the evidence of the witnesses it appeared that it was the duty of the loading or tally clerk to check the contents at the time of loading but this duty was frequently delegated to some underling.

(b) The shed supervisor, goods clerk or the head transhipment clerk supervised the work of the staff.

(c) The officials mentioned in (b) sealed the wagons. The fastening and sealing was often left to underlings.

(d) The duty of checking seals mostly fell upon the guard. The Watch and Ward staff, number-takers and train clerks also checked the seals. In this province seal-checking was not performed by the police except on the border where a temporary system existed.

(e) In yards stationary wagons were guarded by the Watch and Ward staff. On running trains and during shunting operations in yards wagons were not guarded.

The systems in force were not considered satisfactory. Checking at the time of loading or unloading should invariably be done by a responsible officer of the Watch and Ward staff. The officials mentioned in (b) should personally first fasten and seal the wagons. The checking of seals by the Watch and Ward should be frequent and more effective. There should also be a separate police staff for the purpose of checking seals at selected points. Wagons should be guarded during shunting operations and there should be guards on running trains on dangerous sections of the line.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General, in regard to (c), was in favour of lead seals and tin fastening. Referring to (d) he was of opinion that seal-checking should be made part of the duty of the police. *Mr. Simpson*, Deputy Inspector-General, supported him.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, referring to (b), stated that the railway employees got about four annas a day and so supplemented their income by pilferage. At Asansol the Station Superintendent had the contract for loading. As thefts were prevalent he deputed a detective there with the result that the coolies struck work.

Mr. D. N. Mukharjee corroborated *Mr. Bradley*.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, thought that the systems were quite good but that a better class of men was required in the supervisory staff and they should get more pay. The present staff consisted of very poorly educated persons. Again there was not sufficient protection on running trains and wagons were frequently broken into at stations. This could be prevented by having 2 or 3 watchmen in a small brakevan in the middle of each long train.

Assam.

(a) The goods are loaded and unloaded by coolies. The police are not present. The tally clerk and the transshipment clerk check the numbers and enter details of weight, condition of packages, etc., in their books. The goods clerk is held responsible for loading and unloading inward and outward goods to his shed and from it.

(b) There is no supervision worth the name and no regular system. The station master or anybody he may depute supervises.

(c) The system of fastening and sealing wagons is defective. At the despatching station wagons are fastened and sealed in the presence of the station master, goods clerk or transshipment clerk. The doors are fastened by tying two rings with string and affixing a card with the station seal and the officer's signature and date. This is done on both sides of the wagon. There is also a bolt on one side outside the wagon which can be opened by anybody. On journeys wagons are opened, fastened and sealed in the presence of the guard of the train. When wagons are left at a siding at destination or elsewhere the wagons are not properly locked and sealed after they have had to be opened and a portion of the contents have had to be removed.

(d) The number-taker compares the wagons with his books and brings to the notice of the station master any defective seals. The station master calls the police in, if necessary, and has the wagon locked and the key given to the police under sealed cover until an examination can be made. This is done at the earliest possible moment. Responsibility for any shortage found lies on the last despatcher who sealed the wagon before the tampering was detected. Before despatching wagons at starting stations the guard of the train checks the seals.

(e) There is no special system for guarding loaded wagons in yards or on running trains, and it is in fact from these wagons in such circumstances that many of the thefts are committed. The night chowkidars go round occasionally but they rarely find anything wrong. They are supposed to examine the seals.

The witnesses stated that the rules were not adhered to. The supervision of loading and unloading and seal-checking by the police was not recognised as part of their duty.

Inspector Syed Hashmatulla observed that guards and brakesmen were not made responsible for the loss of any theft which occurred in railway trains. The staff did not attend to their duties properly.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated with reference to (a) that loading and unloading was supposed to be done by coolies under the supervision of the loading clerk, or in small stations where there was no loading clerk under the supervision of station masters or the assistant goods clerks. As a matter of fact 3 or 4 wagons were loaded by coolies and then the stacks were counted by the supervising officer only. It was at this time that pilferages were committed as the check was merely nominal.

(b) At Mokameh Ghat there were two Goods Inspectors, one on the East Indian Railway and the other on the Bengal and North-Western Railway. Both officers had so much office work that they could not properly supervise the transshipment work which was done by tally clerks. At other stations transshipment was supervised by goods clerks. At many stations merchants had their own agents who saw to the handling of their employers' goods.

(c) Wagons were fastened and sealed in three ways:—(1) By string with sealing wax and card attachment; (2) by tin shackles with punched seal and card attachment; (3) by wire shackles with punched seal and card attachment.

Sealing by sealing wax should be abolished as it was very easy with a knife to remove the seal and then replace it later. Wire shackles broke occasionally with the oscillation of the train and it would be better if they were abolished and only tin shackles were used. The stock of tin shackles should be kept under lock and key and a proper account should be kept. At present it was possible to pick up an unused tin shackle and utilise it because no check was kept and no one seemed to be responsible. They should be stamped with the year of issue as also with a serial number and the name of the station to which issued. At large stations a record should be kept showing the number of shackles used as also the number of the wagon on which used. These accounts should be checked by the Travelling Inspector of Accounts. Seal-fastening should always be through the cotters and not through the rings of the cotter pins.

(d) The guard was supposed to check the seals of all sealed wagons on his train: (1) when taking over a train; (2) at all stations where his train suffered a detention of

15 minutes or more; (3) when leaving his train. At some joint seal-checking stations the guard and the railway police head constable were supposed to check seals together. It was, however, a well-known fact that guards seldom checked seals on their trains. They might do so when taking over the train but not when arriving at their destination.

(e) There was no system of guarding loaded wagons when shunting or on running trains.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent of Railway Police, Kharagpur, referring to (a) and (b), stated that there was very little supervision and the menial staff were left to do as they pleased. Referring to (c), he said that the goods clerk and his assistant were supposed to seal wagons but the duty was nearly always left to menials. He would not go so far as to say that the seal was left in charge of chowkidars, but they handled it and it was made over to them for the purpose of sealing wagons. Sealing was not done as promptly as it should be. There was considerable delay between the checking of goods and the sealing of the wagons. If the Police were to do seal-checking it should be done by Sub-Inspectors. Referring to (d), it frequently happened that no checking whatsoever was done either by guards or seal-checkers. Referring to (e), at large stations chowkidars were employed to guard wagons in the yards but there was no guarding of running trains.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, referring to (a), stated that pilferages occurred between the time of loading and sealing. Referring to (b), supervision was quite nominal. The sealing of wagons (c) was unsatisfactory. Wagons were loaded and left to the mercy of coolies, chowkidars and shunting staff and sealed after much delay. (d) Guards when checking seals signed incorrect certificates as having done so. The police at their checks neglected seal-checking for want of staff. The checking of the contents of wagons in the presence of the police was also unsatisfactory. A constable or a head-constable from platform duty attended the checking. Cases had occurred in which the contents of wagons were found short at destination. When asked to explain, the constable or head-constable stated that the clerk was responsible for checking, the contents were not unloaded from the wagon and that he could not inspect and count the number of consignments himself.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that the systems, if observed, would be satisfactory, but the rules were seldom actually carried out. He suggested (a) the employment of a greater number of clerks with definite duties allotted to them and better pay, to carry out the duty of unloading, transshipment and loading; (b) the organisation of a supervising staff for this duty at all important stations. An assistant guard should be posted in each mixed train in charge exclusively of parcels and luggage, the guard being left to attend to the public and to perform other duties in connection with the running of the train; to bar all communications between the guard's compartment and the luggage van and strictly to prohibit guards travelling in luggage vans. (c) Padlocks should be provided for all luggage vans attached to passenger trains. The system of sealing wagons with tin shackles as in use on the East Indian Railway and other railways should be made general. Wagons containing valuable goods should be locked in addition to being sealed. Sealing of wagons should not be entrusted to coolies as was permitted now by the goods clerk or the transshipment clerk who should have this work done under his personal supervision. At the present time the seal was always left in charge of *khalsis* who were chiefly meant for loading and unloading. If the wagons were short-loaded the station master was not likely to know. (d) The checking of the contents of wagons with defective seals should always be done in the presence of a literate member of the Railway Police. Wagons with defective seals or with deficient contents should be checked immediately and in no case should be resealed in order to be checked at destination. Where there was no member of the Railway Police a literate outsider should be brought in as a witness.

Inspector Fouzdar Narain Kuar referring to (a), stated that there was no system. Matters were left in the hands of coolies. Only nominal checks were made after consignments had been loaded; referring to (b), that there was no supervising staff; referring to (d), that there was no proper system, although seals were supposed to be checked generally with guards at all engine-changing stations; and referring to (e), that there was no system of guarding wagons in yards except by chowkidars and there was no system at all on running trains.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that—

- (a) was nominally done by loading and unloading foremen;
- (b) nominally by station masters and goods clerks;
- (c) nominally by sealsmen, really by hamals;
- (d) nominally by guards and number-takers;
- (e) at large stations by an exiguous staff of chowkidars; on running trains by guards.

The police assisted in their own interests to prevent an outbreak of crime.

The systems of check in force were most unsatisfactory, being merely nominal. The chief fault lay in the methods of (c) sealing wagons which were defective. Seals could easily be tampered with while detection was difficult. (d) Seal-checking was a farce. The ordinary

sealing wax and shackles were used. Even shackle seals could be tampered with and this would only be detected by minute examination and not immediately. He had invented a seal which on being broken open would let down the wagon doors and had shown it to two companies, but it was not adopted apparently owing to the initial expenditure entailed. There was no security in the present system. All wagons should be locked: that was the secret of the whole matter. Sealing facilitated getting to wagons and therefore encouraged pilferage. The miscreants knew that it could be tampered with and they had always got the excuse that it might have been done in transit or in the yard. It was done in two places: viz., the loading and unloading stations.

Messrs. Hurst, Glackan and Kaula all agreed with the Inspector-General of Police that the systems were unsatisfactory.

Mr. Hurst stated that the staff employed on (a) was generally insufficient for the work with the result that mistakes in despatching goods were continually being made. (b) The menial staff had every opportunity of pilferage and no one was seriously responsible for shortage and pilferage. It was not possible for the station master to supervise this part of the work and it was generally left solely to the foreman. On the Bengal-Nagpur Railway the loading contract was given out to station masters, but on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, the labour was supplied by the Company. The former system was preferable. The coolies were well-paid and if there was anything missing the station master was held answerable for the loss; on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway where the contract system did not exist there was practically no one responsible for the handling of goods. Admittedly a large number of pilferages never came to notice, but that was a matter in which the station master and consignee worked together. (c) The system of fastening and sealing wagons was most defective. Seals were easily removed. (d) Seal-checking was also defective. Checking stations were too far apart and the system was not sound. Seals could be removed without being damaged and the check at an intermediate station seldom disclosed the fact that the seal had been tampered with. (e) There was no real guarding of wagons in yards and on running trains. The staff employed for this work at stations was insufficient. This was evident from the amount of thefts committed in the yards. The guarding of wagons on trains was also defective. Goods trains were on occasion held up for hours at intermediate stations. The guard and the brakesman were jointly responsible for guarding wagons on the train. They had in addition to attend to shunting and to loading and unloading of goods. It was not possible for them to keep an eye on a long line of loaded wagons and to do the other items of their work at the same time.

Sub-Inspector Syed Mazhar Naji, referring to (b), the system of labour in force, was of opinion that in place of the present contract system of hamali on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway the paid system might be introduced. The merit of the system lay in the bettering of the pecuniary condition of the coolies which minimized the chances of mischief. At present the station master might receive Rs. 500 for the handling contract, but would only pay Rs. 250, the hamals thus receiving only Rs. 4 or 5 per mensem. The hamals were sometimes rewarded by merchants. The majority were local men and maintained bullock carts. The loading, unloading and transshipment clerks should be transferred every year to prevent them from mixing with menials.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, referring to (e), stated that the Watch and Ward were supposed to patrol the yard and look after the wagons there but they did not do so.

Inspector Glackan stated that when he referred to the system as being unsatisfactory he meant that supervision which was supposed to be exercised was not exercised and seals which were supposed to be checked were not checked. He suggested the following remedies:—(1) The staff of loading foremen, unloading foremen and transshipment clerks on duty at one time should be doubled and the loading, unloading and transshipment of more than one wagon at a time should not be permitted unless supervised by a foreman or clerk. (2) There should be an assistant goods clerk whose duty should be to seal wagons only. (3) At stations like Khandwa, Harda, Itarsi and Burhanpur there ought to be seal checkers, one for day and the other for night duty. (4) When thefts occurred on running goods trains in a certain section an extra guard should be posted on the train whose duty should be solely to patrol the train when standing in any yard as thieves generally mounted goods trains at a station where an up-gradient commenced, committed the theft and jumped off the train while it was travelling slowly.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that—

- (a) The Traffic Department left the loading and unloading to the hamals by whom they were guided as to what was loaded or unloaded. Until recently there were Police Checkers on duty at the goods and tranship sheds of the principal stations but they had been removed as it had been found impossible for them efficiently to supervise the loading and unloading of probably a dozen wagons at the same time;

- (b) The police on duty at the goods shed supervised the staff so far as it was practicable;
 - (c) The fastening and sealing of wagons was done by a porter whose work was often very indifferent. The police reported all cases in which the fastenings were not secured and the seals were defective;
 - (d) Police Checkers were located at junctions and engine changing stations;
 - (e) There was no police sentry over loaded wagons in yards but the police at several stations patrolled running trains.
- He was of opinion that these systems worked satisfactorily.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the systems were as follows:—

- (a) *Loading*.—The bags were first counted on the platform and again after being placed in wagons; *Unloading*.—The bags were counted when stacked on the goods platform; *Transshipment*.—In the case of a wagon containing several consignments for several stations, goods were sorted and unloaded on the ground and counted. In the case of through consignments the goods were counted in each wagon, *i.e.*, inwards and outwards.
- (b) The goods clerk personally supervised;
- (c) The goods clerk or assistant supervised;
- (d) Seal-checking was done by the goods clerk;
- (e) This was done by the watch and ward staff.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the system was not satisfactory as the goods clerk had too much clerical work to do to be able to supervise the above work, with the result that loading, unloading and sealing were left to the menial staff and this was where the thefts usually occurred and were entered as missing goods when wagons arrived at destination as they were considered seals-intact wagons. What was required was supervision over the goods clerk as he was not above making away with a bale of piece-goods himself when loading a wagon. There was no system which would prevent *pallars* from stealing unconsidered trifles and probably too strict a régime would result in strikes.

Sind.

(a) *Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi*, stated that loading and unloading were supervised by low-paid railway clerks and merchants' mukaddams. The transshipment at Hyderabad was done by a contractor.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that the loading was mostly done by menial staff and not by the station master and supervising staff themselves. The staff then communicated the number of packages to the station staff who entered them in their registers accordingly.

(b) *Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi*, stated that low-paid railway servants did this important work. The labour employed consisted of coolies in many cases of doubtful character.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that the arrangements for (b) were similar to those mentioned in (a).

(c) *Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi*, thought that this was left mostly to coolies. He could not urge too strongly the provision of a patent bolt or lock to goods wagons. In a busy year when the running train thief was hard at work the short loader and the station yard thief also had a good time and the shortages reported due to thefts from running trains went up. The only method of protecting goods was to introduce a thief-proof goods wagon by providing each with a patent bolt or lock. Once the running train thief was eliminated short-loading, short-unloading and thefts in yards would cease to a very great extent as it would no longer be possible to throw the blame on the running train thief. It would then be easy to locate crime and the Police would not be misled by "seal-deficient," "tape-knotted" and other such devices. To endeavour to protect goods trains by sending one or two constables in charge of each was useless and a waste of men. For one thing the constables could only find accommodation in the brake-van at the end of a train generally consisting of about 70 or more vehicles and on a dark night they could not see beyond the 10 last wagons at the most. Patrols on gradients, not permanent but frequently moved from place to place, were effective in dealing with running train thieves.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that the menial staff fastened and sealed wagons. The seal was sometimes left with the chowkidar.

(d) *Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi*, stated that guards, train clerks and at some stations the police were supposed to do this.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that checking was done by the goods clerk but the seal remained with the chowkidar at stations where the loading clerk was inefficient. As soon as checking was finished the chowkidar or the menial staff committed mischief by breaking the seals, pilfering and resealing. They obtained many such opportunities.

(e) *Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi*, stated that in yards goods wagons were guarded by chowkidars and on running trains by guards and in some cases by chowkidars and police as well. He considered the system most unsatisfactory. If the rules were carried out and altered to some extent so that there might be a responsible and well-paid person in big station yards to supervise the loading himself and do the checking and sealing and above all if the wagons were locked the system might be rendered satisfactory. It was really the staff rather than the rules that were at fault.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that the present system of Police travelling with trains was satisfactory. If the loading was done in the presence of a high official and the seal was taken charge of by him there would hardly be an opportunity for mischief at starting stations. The station staff sometimes sent out men with running trains who broke the seals at watering stations where they were resealed. When the wagon arrived at the checking station the theft would be reported to have been committed between the starting place and the watering station. If the packages were removed with the consultation of the Traffic staff at the starting station they sent a special man by 23 Up which left Karachi at 11-30 P.M. in advance of the above goods train. As soon as that train arrived at Dabeji the man got down and on arrival of the goods train, as he already knew the number of the wagon, he broke the seal of that wagon. The wagon being kutchha-sealed was checked at Kotri and theft was thus said to have been committed while the train was in motion between Karachi and Dabeji and therefore the offence remained undetected and no burden lay on the railway staff of the starting station. The man then returned by the next train and went on duty.

Punjab.

(a) Checking is performed by the loading and unloading clerks and in some cases by tally clerks

(b) Loading and unloading clerks and tally clerks supervise the handling staff.

(c) In some cases the wagons are only fastened by means of a piece of string or tape with a seal card attached. In a few cases the staple fastenings are riveted.

(d) Seals are checked at stations where a sufficient halt is made by guards and chowkidars.

(e) Wagons in yards are guarded by chowkidars. Occasionally but very rarely chowkidars are sent with running goods trains.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General of Police, referring to (c), stated that any slack method of sealing wagons was an incentive to crime and as such the Local Government must be interested in the matter. Railways should employ the very best method of preventing thefts from sealed wagons. The present arrangement of tape and card-board was not the best method. Either locks, bolts or rivets should be employed.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General of Police, referring to (a), stated that the system appeared satisfactory, but the staff was apparently insufficient. He urged the introduction of cages on passenger platforms for the safe custody of parcels awaiting shipment; referring to (b) he stated that the supervising staff was said to be inadequate, and referring to (c) he thought the present methods were unsatisfactory. Wagons should be rendered thief-proof by riveting, locking or some other method of fastening. Riveting, so far as it had been tried, had been proved infallible. (d) Seal-checking, as far as his experience went, was of little value in locating crime. It was often abused to cover short-loading and other yard delinquencies. It was extremely difficult to examine seals carefully on a long goods train at night and when the duty was perfunctorily performed (as was almost invariably the case where irksome routine duties were concerned), the results were misleading. All that could be said in its favour was that it had perhaps a moral effect. Seals were often regarded as intact, whereas they were really not intact and that meant that the investigation was more or less permanently blocked. If wagons were properly fastened seal-checking would be generally unnecessary. In the present circumstances the only sure method of localising thefts from running goods trains was the employment of police on such trains, a system used with success whenever epidemics of such crime occurred on particular sections of the line. Referring to (e) he drew attention to his remarks on Question I and stated that additional police should be employed in important areas and, when necessary, for protecting running goods trains.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent of Police, referring to (a), (b) and (c), stated that the systems in force were not satisfactory. The supervising staff should be increased according to local requirements and the wagons should be locked or some sort of key system should be introduced to prevent access by outside thieves. Referring to (d), he said that if wagons were properly locked there was no need of seal-checking, otherwise it was necessary in order to localise crime. Referring to (e) he said that armed police patrols in yards and on running trains were most necessary. The Police had no concern

with the Watch and Ward. On account of the number of crimes he had arranged in the Rawalpindi Station to put policemen on patrol duty during the night and to supervise the Watch and Ward, although there was no extra staff sanctioned for this duty. But at this time when famine was prevailing, the railway thieves were very dangerous and were armed with *chhabies*. Between Wazirabad and Shahdara, and again between Shahdara and Jaranwala, the thieves were generally armed with *chhabies*. He was of opinion that 99 per cent. of the guards on trains were thieves. Guard Williams, for instance, had 21 cases against him. He was eventually arrested and convicted in Lahore. If packages of fresh fruit containing mangoes for example were sent, not one mango would be obtained at the other end. Consignments booked at owner's risk never reached owners safely. He cited the case of a retired Civil Surgeon in Shialpur who sent some articles to his daughter. The guard stole the consignment and when later his house was searched in connection with another case all the articles were recovered. Another guard, a resident of Gujrat, stole a box belonging to a passenger. He was prosecuted and convicted.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir referring to (a) stated that the system worked satisfactorily at small stations, but at large centres the clerks relied on brokers and porters; referring to (b) and (c) he said that the systems were unsatisfactory. The present methods afforded great temptation to thieves. Referring to (d), he said that the system was useful to a certain extent at boundaries, otherwise it amounted to practically nothing. Referring to (e), he stated that the system was unsatisfactory.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated with reference to (a) that loading, unloading and transshipment clerks did this work. (b) Goods clerks supervised the staff employed in handling goods. The system of labour employed on the railway was that of contract labour. Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General of Police, was of opinion that the contractor should be held responsible for work done under (a) and (b) and that his seal should be put on wagons. (c) Menial staff under the supervision of clerks mentioned in (a) and (b) above performed this duty. The clerks were supposed carefully to supervise and check the work, but in consequence of over-work their supervision was purely nominal, and menials, porters and handling staff were left to do as they pleased, the result being that about 70 per cent. of packages were tampered with. Much of this crime remained unreported, because any small difference in weight at destination was ascribed to difference in various scales, and also because a portion of it was shown as missing goods and because deliveries were taken by careless and ignorant consignees without making much fuss. The only remedy was proper supervision by an increased and better paid staff. At important transshipping, forwarding and receiving stations, where work was heavy, there should be responsible officials of the rank of a senior station master personally to supervise the work. (d) Seal-checking was done at starting stations by guards in charge of trains, at destination by train clerks and other officials such as assistant station masters and by the Railway Police at border stations of the province. In the North-West Frontier Province, the Railway Police checked seals at (1) Khairabad, two men, (2) Khushalgarh, one man, and (3) Isakhel, one man. Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, suggested that there should be electric lights on the brake-vans and at intervals on long trains worked off the axle and illuminating powerful side lights on both sides of the train. (e) Loaded wagons in yards were guarded by railway chowkidars and on running trains by guards in charge of trains. The number of chowkidars detailed for this duty was often insufficient and very often loaded wagons were carelessly left standing and were not shunted and collected on one siding, thus making the work of chowkidars more difficult. Guards in charge of trains could not possibly keep an eye on both sides of their trains either while running between stations or while waiting at a station when they had other work to do. There should be 2 police constables or 2 chowkidars on the train, who should be armed with smooth-bore muskets, as the police in the North-West Frontier Province had to deal with more truculent people than most of the places in the rest of India. The thieves were generally armed with pistols or even rifles and worked in large gangs. They came down and looted stations. Recently they had looted Horiwalla in Bannu district. A similar case occurred near Kohat. Recently, they also kidnapped two station masters near Nowshera and ran away with railway property. The train guards should check all seals at all stations where a stoppage of more than 10 minutes occurred.

Question No. 3.—Are the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transshipment sheds satisfactory?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, mentioned that in most stations and yards, the lighting arrangements were generally inadequate. It was a matter to which he had called special attention in more than one official report.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, mentioned that in his section there were no adequate lighting arrangements in any of the large yards. Many yards were extensive and a large proportion of the area was in darkness.

Mr. Ascock, Superintendent of Police, mentioned that lighting arrangements were very defective.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that the arrangements were inadequate everywhere on the metric gauge. He did not think that that fencing or walls alone would prevent thefts from station yards unless they were very high, and there were reliable sentries at spots where the rails passed through them, and at gates for goods and passengers. What was wanted was a disciplined watch and ward, and a patrolling staff similar to a City Police outpost.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent, stated that all the yards and off-sides of trains should be properly lighted.

Inspector Macleod mentioned that generally thefts were committed during the dark hours in the morning when the lights were out, and special arrangements should be made to deal with these contingencies.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that a senior railway officer, when addressed on the subject replied "with the Railway Board cutting down the budget by several crores such matters have to go by the board."

Inspector Farrant stated that vast improvement was required—specially in the matter of lighting which at small stations was practically *nil*.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi stated that the Railway Authorities suffered heavy losses in connection with the payment of claims, and if they made arrangements for the proper lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and yards the amount so spent would be reduced to a nominal figure.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shunler suggested that yards and goods sheds should be provided with fencing at least of the height of a man. In comparison with the huge amount at present paid in claims the suggestion would prove economical in the long run for the railways.

Bombay.

The witnesses did not consider that the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds were on the whole satisfactory.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that only the large yards were properly lighted and gaps were allowed to remain in fences.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that he had noticed that even where an elaborate steel fencing had been erected battens had been removed in order that railway employees might have a short cut to the bazar or to their quarters and that no notice had been taken of the matter by the Railway Company. He gave an instance at Igatpuri. Again, property could easily be lifted over low fencing.

Madras.

The witnesses were generally of opinion that the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transshipment sheds was not satisfactory.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent of Railway Police, Trichinopoly, remarked that lights used to be put out at night when working stopped.

Bengal.

The witnesses considered that lighting in some of the yards stood in need of improvement and that the fencing of goods and transshipment yards was quite inadequate.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, thought that as goods sheds remained closed during the night, good lighting there was not necessary. Transshipment sheds required good lighting as they could not be fenced in.

Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, mentioned that goods sheds were unlighted and unfenced and transshipment yards were generally lighted adequately but not fenced.

Inspector Syed Hashmatullah stated that there was practically no lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transshipment sheds.

Inspector Upendra Chandra Deb agreed.

Behar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that no work was done in the goods sheds at night. The sheds were locked at night and a lamp kept burning outside.

Thefts from goods sheds were very rare. All goods sheds were closed in. There was no fencing-in goods sheds. Transshipment sheds were badly lighted. They were open sheds. Yards were very badly lighted and the absence of satisfactory lighting greatly facilitated thieving.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent of Railway Police, Kharagpur, stated that the lighting and fencing-in goods sheds and transshipment yards was not satisfactory. Lighting on the whole was inadequate and transshipment sheds were mostly open and frequented by numerous outsiders.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent and Inspector Fuzdar Narain Kuar agreed with Mr. Cook.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that both were unsatisfactory. He doubted if there was any goods shed on the Bengal and North-Western Railway, which was provided with lamps. None of the goods sheds was fenced-in. The whole line was unfenced, and even if there was any fencing at any station, this was never kept in good repair. What was required in the case of important goods sheds was regular palisading.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that both the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transshipment yards were most unsatisfactory. Goods sheds were mostly open.

Messrs. Mayberry, Sharif Muhammad Khan, Mazhar Naqi and Baijnath Kaula agreed.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, stated that the lighting at the majority of large stations in the Central Provinces was satisfactory. At the majority of stations there was no fencing around transshipment yards and goods yards. Goods sheds were fenced but were not large enough to accommodate all the goods being handled with the result that goods were stacked outside in the open.

Inspector Gluckan stated that the lighting in goods sheds was satisfactory but in transshipment sheds was unsatisfactory. The goods sheds at Harda and Itarsi were not only too small but were not fenced.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General of Railway Police, stated that neither was satisfactory. More closed goods sheds were necessary. At many stations goods were often allowed to lie even at night unprotected on the passenger platforms. Sometimes one or two hamals were made to sleep near such parcels but they did not constitute an efficient ward. Goods should not be left lying indiscriminately on the tranship platform—they should be loaded into wagons which should be sealed. More lamps were required.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General of Railway Police, stated that the lighting and fencing-in of yards, goods sheds and transshipment sheds was not satisfactory. The use of high-power lamps in certain cities had already considerably reduced the number of burglaries. It would undoubtedly have the same effect in goods and transshipment sheds, but it would be necessary to light the whole yard, otherwise wagons would be shunted into dark places and there looted.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, did not consider the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transshipment yards satisfactory.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that where there was fencing with locks the system was satisfactory. In some places there were open sheds having only a roof. These sheds should be fenced and locked. All sheds should be lit. At present some had lights and some were unlit.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, did not consider that the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transshipment yard were satisfactory. The arrangements were generally inadequate.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim and Inspector Ghulam Dastgir agreed with Mr. Stead.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Shahid Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that neither the lighting nor the fencing-in of goods sheds and transshipment sheds was satisfactory. Although this improvement would cost much money at the outset, it would pay in the long run. Enclosed spaces were provided at stations, goods sheds and transshipment sheds, but they were insufficient for the volume of traffic and consignments were often left outside such spaces.

Question No. 4.—Are pilferages or thefts from—

- (a) goods sheds of goods booked or unbooked ;
- (b) transshipment yards ;
- (c) goods trains ; and
- (d) passenger trains (luggage booked or unbooked) frequent on the length of railway in your charge and do the railway police take any cognizance of such cases, or measures to prevent such losses ? If not, do you consider that they should do so ?

United Provinces.

Name.				Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Kaye, I.G.	(b), (c), (less numerous)
„ Begbie, D.I.G.	(b), (c), ditto
„ Fitzpatrick, Dy. S.P.	(b)
Inspector Macleod	(b)
„ Murphy	(b)
Mr. Sharpe, S.P.	(a), (b), (c) (very) (d)
Inspector Farraut	(a), (c)	(b), (d)
„ Khairat Nabi	(a), (b), (c), (d)
Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz	(a), (b), (c), (d)
„ Peary Shunker	(a), (b), (c), (d)

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, mentioned that thefts and pilferages were as a rule reported to, and taken cognizance of by, the Railway Police. Measures were taken to prevent such losses by deputing train guards with passenger trains for night journeys. Waiting halls and platforms and yards were also patrolled to a certain extent. He did not consider that the Police should be held responsible for losses in yards. The bulk of the thefts took place from (b) yards. It was all a question of protection. Theft from (c) running trains were less numerous.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, mentioned that yard thefts (b) were the heaviest form of crime. The Police did not patrol the sheds as they had not got the men. Theft from running goods trains (c) came next in order.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, mentioned that this was a most troublesome question because the greater portion of goods in goods sheds did not belong to the railways at all, but was the property of merchants awaiting hooking and was left in charge of their men. Station masters had no interest in such goods, since there was no likelihood of a claim being lodged against the railway. He thought that the railway ought to take responsibility for unbooked goods lying in their premises. Then there was the question of handling. Station masters and goods clerks loaded the stuff into wagons and were paid per thousand mannds. If they were able to load more cheaply than the railway paid they got the difference. They loaded more cheaply by not paying or underpaying labourers who helped themselves to wheat, rice, sugar, etc. The goods clerks or the station masters also paid the Railway Police to leave them alone. If the Superintendent insisted on coolies being arrested for pilfering, they struck, as deprived of their wages, they had to steal to live. Some railway officers said that transshipment clerks robbed in order to pay the Police.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent, stated that pilferages and thefts mainly occurred at (b) transshipment sheds.

Inspector Macleod mentioned that the Police took cognizance of all pilferages reported to them. The reports came through the Head of the Department and generally many days elapsed before they arrived. In cases of complete consignments, the Claims Officers sent cases to the Police for enquiry. On an average, it took 10 to 15 days to receive a report. Pilferages from transshipment sheds (b) were as high as 90 per cent. of total. It was really a question of supervision.

Inspector Murphy mentioned that thefts in transshipment yards (b) were very prevalent, amounting to more than 50 per cent. and occurred in the following way. A wagon arrived with seals intact. The stuff was unloaded and taken out in the transshipment shed and loaded in another wagon. During the loading operation pilferage took place. There was no proper supervision in transshipment sheds. It was not the business of the Police to supervise matters in the transshipment shed.

Sub-Inspector Peary Shunker stated that in the case of thefts from (a) goods sheds and (b) transshipment yards the only preventive measures taken by the Police were to go on surprise raids during dark nights. Theft of these two classes could only be prevented by enlisting a better class of chowkidars.

Paragraph II of the Government Railway Police Manual United Provinces lays down that all crimes committed within the limits of a station yard, and (wherever they are committed) all offences in running goods or passenger trains and offences against the Railway Act shall be registered and investigated by the Railway Police.

Paragraph C of Appendix VI to the Manual states.—

In the following circumstances it would be usual for the officer concerned to presume the commission of an offence—

- (1) short receipt of goods from wagons arriving with seals deficient or with top fasteners or ventilators open,
- (2) pilferage or abstraction from consignments in wagons arriving with seals deficient or with top fasteners or ventilators open,
- (3) abstraction of goods by boring into bottoms of wagons,
- (4) goods missing from wagons with seals replaced by bazar locks,
- (5) abstraction from booked luggage or parcels,
- (6) missing luggage or parcels despatched by passenger train,
- (7) goods missing from station premises or goods shed.

Bombay.

Name.			Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Holman, D. I. G.	(a), (b), (c) (very)	(d)
„ O'Brien, S. P.	(c), (d)	(a), (b) (non-cog.).
„ Austin, Dy. S. P.	(c), (d)	(a), (b) („).
Sub-Inspector Rege	(a), (b), (c)	(d)

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General, stated that the increase in cases was due to high prices and also to the recent orders about registering reports of crime on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, thought that there ought to be a special branch of the Railway Police for dealing with the missing goods type of thefts as distances were very great and the ordinary Police had not the time to devote to such enquiries.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, thought that the Police should take cognizance of cases under (a) and (b).

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that thefts from booked luggage under (a) could only be attributed to railway employees who had access to brakevans. He thought that these cases were committed by the second guard who was locked up in the parcel van. The District Police were laughing at the Railway Police because things were quiet in the districts while railway thefts were increasing.

Sub-Inspector Rege stated that thefts of parcels were common at Victoria Terminus till the parcels office was removed. There was no system of gate passes and people could easily get in and out of the yard.

Mr. Lallubhai Hargobindas, Public Prosecutor, Godhra (Panch Mahals), mentioned that last year goods worth four or five lakhs were stolen from running goods trains which the thieves boarded on inclines. The thefts ceased when the District Magistrate ordered the village watchmen to patrol the line. In other cases the Watch and Ward acted in collusion with village thieves.

Rule 778 (2) of the Bombay District Police Manual orders that cognizable offences committed against person or property in running trains, goods or passenger shall be registered and investigated by the Railway Police.

Madras.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, and Mr. Doraiswami, Inspector of Police, stated that cases under all the heads were fairly frequent. The Police took action on cases reported and with a view to prevent such losses constables were deputed to travel in guards' vans and line patrols were instituted at particularly criminal parts of the line. *Mr. Hannington* stated that it was a great drawback that the police deputed for this duty were not armed.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent of Railway Police, Trichinopoly, South Indian Railway, stated that practically all thefts were from booked goods. Theft were mostly recorded from transshipment yards and goods sheds. He gave the following figures to support his contention:—

				1918.	1919.
(1) Thefts from running trains	233	269
(2) „ „ trucks and goods sheds	307	437
(3) „ „ passenger trains	160	177

He ascribed the high figures of No. (2) to inefficient Watch and Ward arrangements.

Rule 642, Volume I, Executive Orders, Madras Police, says —“ On receipt of a report (by telegram or otherwise) from a railway official which appears to show that a cognizable offence has been committed the station house officer will at once send in a First Information Report and proceed to make an investigation according to the Criminal Procedure Code.”

Bengal.

Name.					Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr Bradley, S. P.	(a), (b), (c), (d)
„ Ezechiel, S. P.	(b), (c)	(a), (d)
Inspector Mukharjee	(a), (c), (d)	(b)
„ Banerjee	(b), (c), (d)	(a)

The Railway Police take cognizance when reported. When serious outbreaks occur the Police take preventive measures which however cannot be sustained owing to the routine work being disorganised by the withdrawal of men from various police stations and posts for this purpose.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent of Railway Police, Howrah, was of opinion that a small reserve should be placed at the disposal of the Superintendent of Railway Police for such duties. Both at Howrah and at Asansol he had placed an Inspector and couple of Sub-Inspectors and some constables of the detective staff incharge of a systematic patrol all through the yards which had proved very successful. Men were continually arrested and good information was obtained by spending a certain amount of Secret Service money, but the system could not be adopted indefinitely owing to lack of staff.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent of Railway Police, Sealdah, thought that it was not at all desirable that the Railway Police should take preventive measures, as if they were to do so the question of responsibility would arise and the Police would be held responsible for any loss or theft.

Rule 92, Volume VI, Police Regulations, says —All cognizable crime committed within railway limits shall be registered and investigated by the Railway Police. It is not necessary to wait for the complaint of a railway official, except in cases under section 101, Railway Act.

Assam.

Name.					Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Giles, S. P.	(b), (c)	(a), (d)
Inspector Hashmatulla	(d)	(a), (b), (c)
„ U. C. Deb	(a), (b), (c)	(d)

The Police take cognizance of cases when reported and also try to prevent thefts on goods trains by sending constables occasionally with night trains and also by occasionally watching loading and unloading at transshipment yards, but they do not know the procedure properly and therefore such watching is not usually attended with any benefit.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent of Railway Police, mentioned that in the last 9 months there had only been one case of running train theft. He regarded it as his duty to prevent running train theft. If an outbreak occurred he would ask the District Police to institute patrols and he would allot more men to watch wagons and such work.

The Assam Police work under the same rules as the Bengal Police.

Bihar and Orissa.

Name.					Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna	(b), (c)	(a), (d)
„ Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur	(b), (d)	(a), (c)
Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent	(a), (b), (c), (d)
Inspector Inder Sen Sachar
„ Fouzdar Narain Kuar	(b), (c)	(a), (d)

The Railway Police take cognizance of all cases reported and measures are adopted to prevent losses by posting constables in brake-vans of trains in which thefts have occurred, and by keeping parties of police at the distant signals at some stations.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, said the Police used night patrols, surprise visits and secret watch during epidemics of crime in (b). Cases of (c) were also fairly common. The Police occasionally sent constables in the brake van, and kept raiding parties at the distant signal where many thefts occurred when trains were held up owing to congestion in the yard. Cases of (d) were rare. Offside doors should be locked.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that measures were not taken in his jurisdiction to prevent such losses; if all such cases were taken up by the force the number would have to be considerably increased.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar said that the Bengal and North-Western Railway allowed consignors to keep unbooked consignments at stations for months. Theft took place—no one knew when — and were reported to the Police very late.

Rule 104, Bihar Police Manual, lays down that all cognizable crime committed within railway limits shall be registered and investigated by the Railway Police. It is not necessary to wait for the complaint of a railway official except in cases under section 101, Railway Act.

Central Provinces.

Name	Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Deighton	(c)	(a), (b), (d)
„ Huist	(a), (b), (c)	(d)
„ Mayberry	(a), (b), (c), (d)
Sharif Muhammad Khan ...	(c)	(a), (b), (d)
Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi ...	(a), (b)	(c), (d)
„ „ Baijnath Kaula	(c)	(a), (b)

The Police take cognizance and in the event of outbreaks of crime take suitable preventive measures.

Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan stated that as regards pilferages the railway never reported and thus no action was taken. When the railways found that cases of pilferage were increasing the Police should be informed, and assistance would be given. The Traffic Inspector would not object to the Police working and finding out the state of crime in the yard but the station master and other railway subordinates would object.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi stated that the Police neither took any steps to prevent losses nor was there any necessity for them to do so.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula stated that as regards pilferage no report was made to the Police. Whenever there was an increase in pilferages the railway should inform the Police.

Appendix A to the Police Manual lays down that the Railway Police will register and investigate all offences committed on land within railway limits between the distant signals of a station and all offences against the Railway Act.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

(a) *Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police*, stated that thefts of both booked and unbooked goods were frequent.

(b) Pilfering was also committed during transhipment of goods.

(c) Goods were pilfered from trains both when standing at stations or ascending gradients.

(d) Theft from passengers' luggage were comparatively rare. The Police acted on their own initiative in such cases—the Police on duty with trains specially guarded brake-vans.

Rajputana.

(a) Yes;

(b) Mostly pilferages;

(c) Very frequent;

(d) No.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Rajputana Railway Police, stated that the Government Railway Police took cognisance of all thefts reported, but with the Watch and Ward in the hands of the subordinate officials the Police were handicapped in preventive action. If they took action against a suspected booking office the consequence was that friction was engendered by the Station Master or Traffic Inspector, or both.

The Rajputana Railway Police work according to the United Provinces Police Regulations.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that pilferages and thefts from (a), (b) and (c) were frequent. As regards (d) they were frequent from unbooked articles with passengers but not from booked articles. Owing to the practice of the railway of leaving unbooked goods lying about railway premises unprotected the Railway Police had found it necessary to apply the law strictly and to treat such reports as non-cognizable under section 403, Indian Penal Code. Previously these cases were treated as thefts but that had led to a lot of trouble not so much in Karachi but outside. Merchants simply dumped their goods on the railway premises under the charge of nobody and the railway repudiated all responsibility under the Traffic Manual. When the consignments were stolen the owner rushed to the Police to lodge a complaint. This practice became so bad that it had to be stopped. He was not aware that by refusing to take cognizance of these cases pilferages had increased in consequence. All cases in which a cognizable offence appeared to have been committed were investigated. Attempts were made to prevent crime as far as the limited staff permitted by patrolling yards and gradients and by sending police with trains.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali was of opinion with reference to (a) that pilferages and thefts were frequent. If a member of the superior staff wanted some flour or sugar, a few seers were removed from bags and water or other articles were put in to make the weight correct. The consignee on taking delivery detected that his bag was slack but on being weighed the weight was found correct because of the addition of water or other material. The owner however on opening it at his shop noticed the mischief. If sheds were frequently locked by an experienced and responsible officer thefts and pilferages would probably cease. These cases were only of a trifling nature. With reference to (b) cases also frequently occurred. If there was an officer present at the time of transshipment thefts would cease. With reference to (c) cases frequently occurred when wagons were resealed. With reference to (d) cases were frequently committed by pilferers and pickpockets. Such thefts were of a trifling nature and were generally never reported and therefore no action was taken by the Police.

The Sind Police work according to the Bombay District Police Manual.

Punjab.

The witnesses stated that pilferages and thefts from (a), (b), (c) and (d) were frequent, but that cases under (d) did not occur to the same extent as in the other three cases. The Railway Police formerly declined cognizance of thefts but now took cognizance of cases under all classes.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that no routine measures were taken by the Police to prevent such losses, but he was of opinion that additional police at the expense of Railway Administration should be introduced for the purpose. "Unbooked goods lie along the line for months. The railway should not accept goods unless they can despatch within two or three days."

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that pilferages and thefts under the 4 items had not been on the whole very frequent in the province. The Railway Police took cognizance of such pilferages and thefts immediately on report being made with the exception of thefts from unbooked consignments, which were left unprotected by their owners, which cases fell under Section 403, Indian Penal Code, which was non-cognizable by the police. When such thefts became numerous, special measures were taken at once, such as extra patrolling in the yard, picketing of the goods sheds and their approaches, and extra patrolling of passenger and goods trains.

Question No. 5.—Are pilferages from consignments of particular classes of goods—(a) arms and ammunition, (b) fresh fruit, (c) liquor, (d) fish—numerous on the length of railway in your charge?

What special arrangements are made for the protection of such consignments?

United Provinces.

Name.			Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General	...		(b)	...
„ Acock, Superintendent of Police	...		(b)	(a)
„ Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police	...		(b), (d)	...
Inspector, Macleod	(c), (b) and (d) (unreported).	
„ Murphy	(b), (c)	(a)
Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent of Police	...		(b), (c)	(a), (d)
Inspector Farvant	(c), (b) and (d) (unreported).	
„ Khairat Nabi	(b), (c)	(a), (d)
Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz	...		(c)	(a), (b), (d)
„ „ Peary Shunker	(a), (b), (c), (d)

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that pilferage from fruit parcels (b) was the most common. He was strongly of opinion that such goods should be booked at railway risk, even if that meant the raising of freight charges.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, stated that he had very little experience of pilferage from (a) arms and ammunition. Fresh fruit (b) was pilfered to such an extent that the

ordinary person would not book it except by post. Liquor (c) used to be very much stolen at one time from transhipment sheds and parcels offices but cases were not so frequent now because special measures were adopted for sealing the cases.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, mentioned that there were numerous complaints of theft from (b) fresh fruit, and (d) fish, but these cases were very seldom reported to the police. The public did not, as a rule, complain.

Inspector Macleod stated that in the case of (c) liquor, there was a good deal of pilferage, casks being tapped and bottles extracted from boxes. The staff at transhipment stations were responsible. There were also pilferages of fresh fruit (b), but generally fresh fruit and fish (d) were not reported as the amount pilfered was trifling. Liquor (c) was carried in ordinary wagons in barrels and sealed, (a) arms and ammunitions were handed over to the guard and treated as parcels.

Inspector Murphy stated that he had not had a single case of (a) arms and ammunition. Fresh fruit (b) was of daily occurrence being booked at owner's risk. He had had a number of cases of thefts of (c) liquor, from transhipment sheds and parcels offices. Fish (d) was booked at owner's risk. (b) and (d) were mostly pilfered in the vans.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that railway servants were responsible for such thefts. "They are wise to the fact that the railway administration accepts no responsibility in the matter and they are aware that no censure or punishment will be given to them for any shortage or pilferage, and they help themselves accordingly." With reference to the special arrangements made by the Railway Company, guards of trains were given special instructions regarding (a), and the Railway Police at Junction stations received telegrams occasionally to make a joint check of such consignments. This check was resented by guards and had led to friction in the past. Such consignments should be booked at railway risk. There were no special arrangements in force for (b), (c) and (d).

Inspector Farrant, referring to (c) thefts of liquor, stated that these were frequent between Bombay and Jhansi. Enquiries made showed that they did not occur in the United Provinces but between Bombay and Bina. No special arrangements were made for the protection of such consignments. Whilst awaiting despatch or delivery, consignments were supposed to be kept under lock and key but this was seldom done.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz, referring to (b), was of opinion that railway employees who handled these packages or the guards and brakemen in the luggage vans pilfered them. Nothing could prevent them from doing so except that when such cases occurred special men should be deputed to try to arrest individuals red-handed. Referring to (d) he suggested that such packages were pilfered in the brake-van or on the platform by the Refreshment Room staff. The same procedure as suggested in (b) should be adopted.

Bombay.

Names.		Frequent.		Infrequent.
Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General	...	(b) (c) (European)	...	(a) (d)
Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent of Police	...	(b) (c)	...	(a)
Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police	...	(c) (d) (dried)		
S. I. Rege	(b)	...	(a) (e) (d)

No special arrangements are made for (b) and (d). Regarding (c) special arrangements are made for European liquor which is taken charge of by one guard and handed over to the relieving guard after signatures are given in the register. There are also special arrangements for (a).

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, referring (d), stated that there were no thefts of fresh fish as the traffic was local and the owner usually travelled with it. Theft of dried fish which were fairly frequent were committed by the railway staff and running-train thieves.

Madras.

Names.		Frequent.		Infrequent.
Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General	...	(b) (c) (d)	...	(a)
Mr. Windle, Superintendent of Police	...	(b) (c)	...	(a) (d)
Inspector Doraiswamy	(b) (c) & (d) (unreported)	...	(a)

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, stated that pilfering of fresh fruit, liquor and fish was fairly common but such cases were not often reported as the consignees only noticed the pilfering after taking delivery. There were generally no special arrangements for such consignments in transit but special Police arrangements were made when cases became frequent in any particular locality.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, stated that pilferages only occurred from consignments of fresh fruit and vegetables on the South Indian Railway. Special arrangements were difficult because the main fruit traffic came from Bangalore over another line till it reached Jalarpet. The greater part of the pilferage from fruit consignments was either done by railway employees or with their connivance. Special sealed fruit vans in charge of one particular brakesman or under-guard on whom responsibility could be fixed seemed to be the only method of preventing this form of crime.

Inspector Doraiswamy stated that all pilferages of fresh fruit, liquor and fish were not reported so did not appear numerous. He corroborated *Mr. Hannington*.

Bengal.

Names.	Frequent.				Infrequent.
Mr. Bradley, S. P.	(b) (c)	(a) (d)
Mr. Ezechiel, S. P.	(b) and (d) (unreported)	(a) (c)
Inspector Mukharjee	(b) (c)	(a) (d)
Inspector Banarjee	(b) (d)	(a) (c)

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, and *Inspector Mukharji* stated there were special rules for (a) which were treated as insured articles.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, stated that as (c) fruit and vegetables and (d) fish were booked only at owner's risk and the packing was defective pilferage was common.

Assam.

Names.	Frequent.				Infrequent.
Mr. Giles, Superintendent of Police	(b) (d)	(a) (c)
Inspector Hashmatullah	(b) (c) and (d) (unreported)	(a)
„ U. C. Deb	(b) (c) (d)	

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, Chittagong, stated that pilferage of (b) fresh fruit and (d) fish were common. Rice, oil and edibles were also pilfered. No special arrangements were made except those laid down in the Assam-Bengal Railway Traffic Manual, Chapter 2, rules 11, 12, 25, 28, 31, 34, 35, 39, 40, 43, 52, (7, 10). The railway staff were recently notified in the weekly gazette that edible and perishable goods must be checked and reweighed at every transshipment station and at their destination and remarks must be made in the proper form if any shortage was found.

Inspector Hashmatullah stated that cases of (b), (c) and (d) occurred but were not often reported to the police. No special arrangements were made for the protection of these classes of consignments.

Bihar and Orissa.

Names.	Frequent.				Infrequent.
Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna	(b) (d)	(a) (c)
„ Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur	(b) (d)	(a) (c)
Babu P. D. Misra (not very numerous)	(b) (c) (d)	(a)
Inspector Inder Sen Sachar	(b) (d)	(a) (c)
„ Fauzdar Narain Kuar	(b) (but not reported)	(a) (c) (d)

Mr. Ezechiel stated that the Police had nothing to do with the protection of these consignments.

Mr. Cook stated that no special arrangements were made.

Babu P. D. Misra stated that the railways made special arrangements for the protection of consignments of arms and ammunition by carefully checking, locking, sealing, and wiring ahead to the destination station. In the fruit season at Mokameh Ghat a special staff was detailed to avoid delay and to prevent thefts.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that the railway made no special arrangements for the protection of consignments and that petty pilferages were not reported to the police. If consignees found on taking delivery that there was a deficiency they seldom reported the matter to the railway authorities knowing that no claim would be entertained as complaints to the Railway Police were usually made through the railway and the Railway Police seldom received complaints of such cases.

Central Provinces.

Names.					Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Deighton	(a) (b) (c) (d)
„ Hurst	(a) (b) (c) (d)
„ Mayberry	(b)	(a) (c) (d)
„ Glackan	(a) (b) (c) (d)
„ Sharif Muhammad Khan	(c)	(a) (b) (d)
„ Mazhar Naqi	(b)	(a) (c) (d)
„ Baij Nath Kaula	(a) (b) (c) (d)

Messrs. Deighton, Hurst, Mayberry, Sharif Muhammad Khan, Mazhar Naqi and Baij Nath Kaula stated that no special arrangements were made for the protection of such consignments.

Inspector Glackan referring to (a) stated that such consignments were kept in charge of the parcel clerk and were locked in a room.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent and Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi stated that pilferages of fruit (b) abounded in the season but were not generally reported to the Police.

Hyderabad.

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, said that no cases occurred under (a) and (d), but did occur under (b) and (c). No special arrangements were made for the protection of such consignments.

Rajputana.

- (a) No.
- (b) Very numerous.
- (c) Very numerous.
- (d) No.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that railway guards were responsible for the theft of fresh fruit which was a disgrace to the railway companies. Quick transit through junctions where packages were at present left lying for hours and where pilferages occurred, should be insisted on.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, and *Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali* both agreed that pilferages from consignments of (b), (c) and (d) were numerous. Regarding (a) *Mr. Barker* was of opinion that no cases occurred while *Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali* was of opinion that consignments of arms were sometimes pilfered but not ammunition.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated with reference to (b), that thefts were not reported to the police; with reference to (c) that thefts occurred from running trains or from the loading station; with reference to (d) that thefts occurred at loading and unloading stations. Fish was also booked at owner's risk.

Both officers stated that no special arrangements were made for the protection of these articles, but if there was proper supervision at the time of loading and unloading pilferage could be stopped.

Punjab.

The witnesses stated that pilferages from consignments of (a) were not numerous but from (b), (c) and (d) were numerous.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that no particular arrangements were made except for (a) which were carried under the custody of the guard in the brake-van. Protective measures for (b), (c) and (d) should be (1) the provision of cages on platforms for safe custody; (2) observation by plain clothes detectives who would actually work with coolies. The matter could be arranged in consultation with the District Traffic Superintendent.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that pilferages from consignments of the classes mentioned were not numerous in the province. There were no special arrangements for consignments of (b), (c) and (d), and also no special arrangements for (a) unless large quantities of Government arms were being transhipped, when a military guard accompanied them. Consignments of (a) should be treated as if they were insured articles and carried in specially secured compartments in brake-vans or wagons under the close and immediate supervision of the guard in charge of the train. At destination they should be made over personally to the official in charge of parcels and should not be left unprotected to be handled or removed from place to place by menials and porters. The railway should insist on better and more secure packing of consignments of (b), (c) and (d) and should not accept badly or defectively packed consignments.

Question No. 6.—Are reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons made to the railway police for enquiry.

What is the system in force with regard to the registration and investigation of such cases ?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that reports of shortages were made and the Police themselves ascertained a good deal regarding such shortages. Informal enquiry was made as soon as a report was received, but formal enquiry was not made unless the report of the shortage was transferred from the Missing Goods Register to the Crime Register.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that the system varied with each Railway Administration. The East Indian Railway and the Bengal and North-Western Railway reported every case. The Great Indian Peninsula and the North-Western Railway reported very few cases. On receipt of a report the case was registered and investigation was made, but the result was nil. Although some valuable time was lost by delay in reporting, he did not think that that vitiated any chances of success. Nothing could be done with this form of crime unless the railway officials co-operated with the Government Railway Police and took disciplinary action against suspected stations and the loading staff. He would have a 'black list' of stations.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that the Railway Authorities made reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons and the Police decided if the case was to be treated as a theft or as one of missing goods. If the report did not clearly state that the consignment had been cut or opened, the Police inspected the consignment, and if they considered that it had been cut and opened the case was registered and investigated, but not otherwise.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent of Railway Police, stated that if it appeared from the wording of the telegram regarding a "seal-intact" shortage, that there was reasonable suspicion of theft, the case was registered and taken up, but not otherwise.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, stated that the expression "reasonable suspicion" was a vague term and capable of different interpretations. "One man suspects theft where another would not." The railway wanted a more competent enquiry department.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that the system varied on different railways and in different provinces and was unsatisfactory. Cases were usually registered after such a delay that investigation was futile. A preliminary enquiry, if any, of a very imperfect nature was made by the railway. Unless the first report (wires from goods clerks) clearly indicated a theft, (which it seldom did) the result of delivery was ascertained by the Police and nothing further was done until a reply was received. Supposing a shortage was reported at Tundla from a wagon bearing intact seals of Cawnpore, the Police filled in a form and sent it to the Cawnpore Railway Police Station to make enquiries. The Sub-Inspector there would enter the report in the Missing Goods Register and would go down to the shed and make enquiries, and endeavour to find out in what condition the consignment left. The railway staff themselves made the same sort of enquiry. If the case were found to be one of obvious theft it would be registered at once in the Crime Register and an investigation would be started. In the case of shortages amounting to less than five per cent. of the consignment the Police refused investigation. He suggested that reliable supervision of loading and unloading and genuine enquiries at both stations would improve matters. When the railway reported they must give cogent reasons. They should not send vague wires. Some responsible goods clerk or the station master should state the reasons for their suspicion. The registration and investigation of cases were governed by the Circular regarding enquiries into Missing Goods cases—*vide* Appendix VI, page 48, Government Railway Police Manual, United Provinces. "The question is a vexed one bristling with difficulties and I hesitate to formulate a considered opinion." He advocated the suggestion that the rules in force on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway (Order No. 89, of the Traffic Working Instructions Book, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph (c)) should be adopted universally on all railways. Missing goods work on the East Indian Railway had attained huge proportions with the result that a Sub-Inspector had to be told off to cope with it. The results obtained were practically nil. In view of the clerical labour involved and the poor results obtained he suggested that the existing rules should be abandoned. "I would scrap the existing rules insisting on the railways making a preliminary enquiry and if necessary substituting a prescribed form in which such cases should be reported and detailed reasons given for presuming that a theft has taken place before the Police are called upon to make an investigation. It is the duty of the railway to safeguard their own interests and this procedure would end the present irresponsible method of issuing vague and unnecessary telegrams." He admitted that it was true to a certain extent that it was useful to the Railway Police to know where shortages were occurring, but that information would be obtained if the railways sent monthly summaries instead of worrying the Police with daily reports.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi stated that reports were made to the Police only in exceptional cases. Shortages of complete packages from seal-intact wagons were not registered or enquired into unless the Railway Authorities were definitely of opinion that a theft had been committed. Shortages from packages which appeared to have been tampered with dishonestly were registered and enquired into by the Police at the starting station.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated that fifty per cent only of the cases were reported, five per cent of such cases were registered and investigated, but the investigation was a waste of time because the information reached the Police too late.—For instance, a sealed wagon leaving Benares Cantonment for Howrah with two bags of sugar short (either stolen in Benares or not loaded by the sender) on 1st February 1921 would arrive at Moghal Serai the same day and at Howrah about the 10th or 11th. On being unloaded there two bags would be found short. A telegram would issue on 12th and would reach Benares Cantonment the same day or the 13th. After a fortnight had elapsed all the stuff would have been disposed and nothing could be done by the Police.

Sub-Inspector Percy Shunker stated that reports of shortages of missing goods from seal-intact wagons were made to the Police. In such cases a preliminary enquiry was made on receipt of the report and if the shortage appeared to be due to rough handling or difference of scale, or the missing of a complete consignment appeared to be a case of mis-despatch, no action was taken, but if a theft was suspected the case was registered and enquired into.

Government Railway Police Manual.

APPENDIX VI.

Rules regarding enquiry into missing goods cases.

1. The term "missing goods" applies to any property entrusted to a Railway Company for conveyance regarding which information of short delivery or non-delivery is given by the consignor or consignee or by the railway.
2. The authorities of the following railways, namely the—

East Indian Railway,
Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway,
Great Indian Peninsula Railway,
North-Western Railway,
Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway,
Rohilkhand and Kumaon Railway,

have agreed that the Police shall not enquire into cases of reported loss or shortage unless they have reason to suspect the commission of a cognizable offence.

3. The Bengal and North-Western Railway not agreeing to this, have desired that the Police on that line shall deal with every shortage in which the preliminary enquiry held by the railway staff has ended in failure.

4. It will be observed that the principle governing Police action is entirely different in the two cases. In the case of the railways specified in paragraph 2, Police interference is not wished for unless there is reason other than the mere loss, for believing that a cognizable offence has been committed, whilst on the Bengal and North-Western Railway, Police assistance is required in all cases in which the railway staff have failed to trace the goods.

5. The following procedure will be observed in future by the Railway Police in dealing with such reports:—

At each station two registers, one in yellow form A, the other in red form B, (samples attached) will be maintained. On receipt of information that goods are missing the station officers in whose jurisdiction the shortage is discovered will at once make an entry in form A, sending a copy to the station officer of the length in which the despatching or transhipping station, as the case may be, is situated for entry in form B. So far as the Police on the Railways specified in paragraph 2 are concerned no other action will be taken by them, but on the Bengal North-Western Railway both of these officers will, on receipt, whether at the time or at any later stage, of intimation of the failure of the railway staff to trace the goods, make the enquiry personally or depute a subordinate to do so reporting the result through the usual channel.

Should there be reason for believing either from the nature of the consignment or from the damaged state of the seal or covering of the goods or otherwise that an offence has been committed, it is the duty of the station officer on all railways to at once prepare a check receipt, record the offence in the Crime Register and take up the investigation.

6. In the following circumstances it would be usual for the officer concerned to presume the commission of an offence:—

- (i) Short receipt of goods from wagons arriving with seals deficient or with top fasteners or ventilators open.
- (ii) Pilferage or abstraction from consignments in wagons arriving with seals deficient or with top fasteners or ventilators open.
- (iii) Abstraction of goods by boring into bottoms of wagons.
- (iv) Goods missing from wagons with seals replaced by bazaar locks.
- (v) Missing luggage or parcels despatched by passenger train.
- (vi) Goods missing from station premises or goods sheds.

7. An offence should of course be registered and enquired into in the police jurisdiction in which it occurred. On the railway however it is frequently very difficult to ascertain exactly where any given offence has occurred and for this reason the best rule to follow when an offence cannot be located is that the offence shall be registered and investigated by the station officer to whom the first report of the loss is made. If in the course of his enquiry it is clearly established that the offence was committed in another jurisdiction and can be more advantageously enquired into by the station officer of that jurisdiction he should of his own authority transfer the case and the enquiry to that officer of that jurisdiction, and the officer to whom the case has been thus transferred should not at that stage raise any objection to the transfer. He should accept the case and defer making any representations in connection with the transfer until after the completion of the enquiry.

Bombay.

In the case of part pilfering or extraction the case is registered and immediate enquiries are commenced. If whole consignments are reported missing no action is taken by the Police unless the Railway Company can satisfy the Police that it is a clear case of theft.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that such cases were not reported to the Police.

Mr. Guider, formerly Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Bombay, and now Watch and Ward Superintendent, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that the rules so far as the Bombay Presidency was concerned were not as satisfactory as they might be, which, however, was due to the interpretation of the opinion expressed in the Police Commission's Report. He was referring more to the Police refusing to register thefts when reports were made to them by the railway authorities of missing goods, because the Police Commission said that the railways were responsible for looking after the goods in their charge and unless it was proved that an offence had actually been committed the Police ought not to take cognizance.

No rules in the Police Manual.

Madras.

The witnesses reported that they were registered in a special register and enquired into as shortages. If a cognizable case was found to have occurred it was again registered as such. The railways were supposed to make enquiries first but were apt to leave the whole investigation to the Police. The District Traffic Superintendent was informed of the result of the Police enquiry. Greater care was now exercised by the Railway in reporting shortages to the Police. This discrimination was particularly noticeable in the matter of short loading.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General of Police, stated that the police point of view was that shortage in itself was not a police matter unless it had actually been proved to be due to theft. The former railway point of view was that everything that was short was a matter for the Police to take up. The point was referred to the Advocate-General whether it was legal for the Police to refuse to register first information of shortages until they had been proved to be thefts, as a result of which it was decided that the Police should not register a case unless it was found to be a theft. He was of opinion that there should be some kind of central staff to deal with these cases, because shortage due to theft might have occurred at Bombay but the fact was not known until the train reached Madras. In long distance cases there ought to be some organization or some travelling staff which should be able to secure the aid of the local police and to co-ordinate matters. There should be one organization for a group of railways.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, stated that formerly indiscriminate reporting led to much unnecessary correspondence but now owing to greater care very few cases of shortage were received by the Railway Police for investigation.

Rule 643 of the Executive Orders of the Madras Police, Volume I, states :—

The Police shall not register information of "Shortages" or of the loss or missing of property as crimes, or proceed to make an investigation according to the Criminal Procedure Code upon such information, unless there is reasonable suspicion that a cognizable case has been committed in connection with the loss of the articles. They shall, however, register such information in the General Diary and take what steps they can to trace the missing articles.

Bengal.

Shortages and missing goods from seal-in tact wagons are treated under P. R. B. Volume VI, rules 93—95. No investigation is made unless the Railway Company establishes a case of theft.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General of Police, thought that the rules laid down in Bengal were fairly satisfactory.

Rules 93, 94 and 95 of Volume VI, Police Regulations, Bengal, 1915.

93. The term "missing goods" is applied to any property entrusted to a railway company for conveyance regarding which information of short delivery or non-delivery is given by the consignor or consignee or by the railway.

94. "Missing goods" cases shall be classified as follows.—

Class A—

- (1) Short receipt of goods from wagons arriving with seals intact.
- (2) Cases in which, though wagons arrive with seals intact, the cases or, coverings of cases are found to be torn or merely damaged.
- (3) Missing luggage and parcels despatched by passenger train, except where there are strong reasons for suspecting a theft has been committed.
- (4) Consignments not found in a torn or cut condition but which, on re-weighment, appear to be light.

Class B—

- (1) Cases in which, though wagons arrive with seals intact, the packages or coverings of packages have obviously been cut or tampered with.
- (2) Short receipt of goods from wagons arriving with seals deficient or with top fasteners or ventilator open.

- (3) Goods missing from wagons with seals replaced by hazar locks.
- (4) Abstraction of goods by boring into bottoms of wagons or trucks.
- (5) Cases in which articles or goods have been abstracted from booked luggage or parcels.
- (6) Goods missing from station premises or goods sheds.

95. On receipt of information by telegram or writing that goods are missing, the officer in charge of the police station will enter the case in the Missing Goods Register. (P. R. B. Form No. 288.) If the case falls within Class B, he will then draw up a first information report and investigate in the usual way. If the case falls within class A, or if the information received is insufficient to place the case within class B, he will refuse to take up the case until the Railway Authorities, by means of a preliminary enquiry or otherwise, have shown that there is reasonable ground for suspecting that a cognizable offence has been committed.

Assam.

Such cases are not investigated unless the Police see sufficient reasons. When cases of missing goods or shortages from seal-intact wagons are reported the Police use Form T.-48 but do not investigate. Missing goods cases are divided into two classes "A" Non-criminal and "B" Criminal. In "A" class cases the Police take no action unless the Railway Authorities can point out sufficiently reasonable grounds for the suspicion that a cognizable offence has been committed from the circumstances of the occurrence. Enquiry by the Police into "B" class cases or transfer from "B" class cases to "A" class without sufficient cause has been condemned strongly under the joint Railway Police and Traffic Department rules drawn up in August 1913, *vide* Chapter 9, Assam-Bengal Railway Traffic Manual, rule 14, page 299. These cases are very difficult to detect and it is a frequent occurrence that delay is made in reporting them to the Police.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent of Railway Police, was of opinion that a great deal of work in this connection was thrown on the Police which should legitimately be done by the Claims Branch of the Traffic Department. The Superintendent of Railway Police in 1914 reported that he considered the rule laying down that the case must be instituted at the station where the shortage first came to notice was unsatisfactory and recommended that where goods were booked through a foreign railway or through a steamer company the enquiry should begin at the transshipment station. In the case of goods booked through from Calcutta the enquiry should start at Chandpur or Gauhati, and if it were proved that the Assam-Bengal Railway had received the consignment in broken or pilfered condition no further steps should be taken by the Chittagong Railway Police, the papers being simply handed over to the Sealdah or Saidpur Railway Police in Bengal or to the River Police. This practice was being observed.

Rule 14—Chapter 9, Assam-Bengal Railway Traffic Manual.

14. *Missing Goods Police Procedure.*—The term 'missing goods' is applied to any property entrusted to a railway management for conveyance regarding which information of short delivery, or non-delivery, is given by the consignor or consignee or by the railway.

2. The Government Resolution on the Police Commission Report clearly lays down that the Railway Police have nothing to do with shortages which are not due to some criminal offence. It is often difficult to decide, till an investigation has been made, whether the shortage is due to a criminal offence or not. In very large number of cases there can be no doubt that the shortages are due to theft or criminal misappropriation. It is difficult, therefore, for the Police to refuse to enquire into the cases reported.

3. To prevent the Police from being burdened with unnecessary investigations, the Traffic Manager in consultation with the Superintendent of Railway Police has ordered that only the following missing goods cases should be reported to the Police, namely:—

First—When packages are found short from wagons with broken wagon seals.

Second—When packages are noticed to be in an open state on unloading and from the condition it is clear that such open state is due to pilfering. Station Masters are to be careful not to confuse open state due to ordinary damage with open state due to deliberate pilfering.

Third—Instances of station coolies or outsiders being actually detected in the act of pilfering from wagons or goods sheds.

Fourth—When goods which have been unloaded in good condition are found to be in pilfered state when making delivery which obviously proves that pilferage has taken place at the station.

Fifth—Any cases not included in the above, which are of a suspicious nature and in which station masters have reason to believe that theft has taken place.

4. Reports in missing goods cases should be sent to the nearest railway police station. The reports must give full particulars of the station from and the station to which the goods were despatched, and also the place where the pilferage was first noticed. When a report is sent by wire it should invariably be followed up by a written report.

No reports should be sent to the Police when there are shortages in the number of packages out of a consignment, as in most cases this is not due to theft but to misdespatch or exchange.

5. The checking of seals on wagons is no part of the duties of the Railway Police, but it may sometimes be found necessary to depute detectives to check seals so as to locate shortages, but the work if undertaken should be carefully supervised by superior police officers.

6. Where an unusual number of shortages are reported from any particular station or section of the railway, and the Superintendent is of opinion that special preventive measures are necessary, he should submit a report to the Agent and Traffic Manager.

7. The Police will furnish the Agent with a monthly statement showing the number of missing goods cases pending enquiry for over a month.

8. A copy of the final report in every missing goods case will be furnished to the Traffic Manager.

9. Police officers enquiring into missing goods cases must bear in mind that their reports are of value to the Railway Authorities in deciding claims, and they should be, careful, therefore, to write full and comprehensive reports abstaining from making allegations against railway subordinates which they cannot substantiate, at the same time bringing to notice neglect or carelessness on the part of railway servants or any defect they may detect in the working of goods on the railway or steamers.

Bihar and Orissa.

Reports of shortages of missing goods from seal-intact wagons are made to the Police, who merely enter the case in the Missing Goods Register. This procedure is adopted by the Police both at the despatching and receiving stations. If the Railway Authorities by means of a preliminary enquiry or otherwise satisfy the Police that there is a reasonable ground for suspecting that a cognisable offence has been committed, the case is registered by the Police of the sending station and is enquired into.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent of Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that as a rule reports were only made when a claim was preferred.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that according to the Railway Police Departmental Rules *vide* Police Manual, Rule No. 492—after the Railway Authorities by a preliminary enquiry had established that the shortage from a seal-intact wagon was due to a cognisable offence having been committed, the case should be registered at the station where the shortage was discovered. In actual working, he could say from experience, that this rule was defective and in his opinion the enquiry should start from the place where the wagon was originally despatched with seals-intact and the case should be registered there. This was in keeping with the practice of the Railway Authorities who debited the staff of the sending station if they had to pay any claim on the shortage from the seal-intact wagon. Chances of a clue being obtained were far greater if an immediate enquiry at the sending station were made rather than by enquiring at the station where the shortage was discovered. The Railway Authorities judged the efficiency of the goods clerks by the number of cases in which they succeeded in obtaining a clear receipt. (Mr. Cook corroborated this view.) It was a mistake to register these cases where discovered as laid down in rule 492. They should be registered where wagons last left with seals-intact. This was in accordance with railway practice.

The following rules in the Bihar and Orissa Police Manual, deal with the subject:—

489. The term "missing goods" is applied to any property entrusted to a Railway Company for conveyance, regarding which information of short delivery or non-delivery is given by the consignor or consignee, or by the railway.

490. "Missing goods" cases shall be classified as follows:—

Class A.

Cases in which —

- (a) from the condition of the seals or locks of the wagon,
- (b) the condition of the coverings of the packages,
- (c) the weight, or,
- (d) absence of any circumstances in the railway report, proving the contrary,

it may reasonably be presumed that the shortage is due to a cause other than a criminal offence.

Class B.

Cases in which —

- (a) the railway make a definite charge or where,
- (b) from the condition of the seals or locks of the wagon,
- (c) from the condition of the coverings of the packages, or,
- (d) other circumstances in the railway report,

it may be reasonably believed that the shortage is due to a criminal offence.

491. On receipt of information by telegram or writing that goods are missing, the officer-in-charge of the Police station will enter the case in the Missing Goods Register (P. M. Form No. 104). If the case falls within Class B, he will then draw up a first information report and investigate in the usual way. If the case falls within Class A, or if the information received is insufficient to place the case within Class B, he will refuse to take up the case until the Railway Authorities, by means of a preliminary enquiry or otherwise, have shown that there is reasonable ground for suspecting that a cognisable offence has been committed.

492. Enquiry will commence at the station at which the defect or shortage is discovered or reported * * *

If as a result of the first day's enquiry it is found that the case has occurred in another jurisdiction the first information and case diaries will be sent to the police station concerned * * *

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that under the rules reports were not ordinarily made on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. On the Bengal-Nagpur Railway, however, reports were made and were registered at once as thefts against the despatching stations. Railway crime was of two classes: (1) crime due entirely to negligence and want of supervision on the part of the Railway Company, which it was the duty of the Railway Company to prevent. If all that could be stamped out then the Police would be relieved of a great deal of unnecessary work and would be enabled to deal with (2) professional crime which was the proper province of Railway Police.

Messrs. Hurst, Mayberry, Glackan, Sharif Muhd. Khan, Mazhar Naqi and Baijnath Kaula agreed.

No rules in the Police Manual.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General of Railway Police, stated that reports were made by the Nizam's Guaranteed State Railway and recently by the Madras and Southern

Mahratta Railway but not by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. On receipt of a telegram the Police immediately made enquiries as to the condition and nature of the seals and if they bore the seals of a despatching station beyond the jurisdiction of the administered area no further action was taken in the matter as the telegram reporting the shortage had already been sent to the station concerned. If, however, the despatching station was in the administered area, the Police registered and investigated the case at the point where the shortage was discovered. Where the whole case was not in his hands he investigated the complaint so far as it concerned himself and then made a report. For instance, in a case from Bombay he would report particulars showing how the wagon arrived, what contents were missing and send the report on to the Railway Authorities—the District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, but not to the Police. A copy of the telegram reporting such cases to the Traffic officials should be sent—(a) to the Sub-Inspector of the range in which it came to notice, (b) to the Superintendent, Railway Police.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General of Railway Police, stated that reports of shortages or missing goods from seals intact wagons were not made to the Police though potentially every such case was a theft. It would be unfair to the Police to hold them responsible for prevention of thefts or missing goods when in seal-intact wagons because the occurrence of such shortages clearly indicated thefts from the sealing stations by railway menials and clerks. Experience had shown that shortages did not decrease by any system of fines. The proportion of missing goods from seals-intact wagons which proved to be merely mistakes of cross-loading and short-loading was very small, probably amounting to 6 or 7 per cent. Offences of theft on the metre-gauge were not so numerous as those on the broad-gauge. The reason was unknown. The figures were:—Thefts of booked goods in transit—307 in 1919, and 316 in 1920, as against 426 on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Section. Thefts from passenger trains: 211 in 1919 and 222 in 1920, as against 417 on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Section. The difference in the mileage of the two gauges in his jurisdiction was only about 50 miles in a total length of 1,500 miles, while thirty per cent less crime occurred on the metre-gauge section. The country was no doubt sparsely populated but this did not entirely account for the difference. A great deal of this crime was perpetrated by the menial staff and it was difficult to get them dismissed. It was, therefore, worth their while to continue even with petty thefts. Deterrent punishment should be given for petty thefts or any other form of crime. If one of the culprits was sent to jail there was some chance of thefts decreasing.

The Rajputana Railway Police work according to the United Provinces Government Railway Police Manual.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that reports were not made to the Police of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons. It was laid down in the Traffic Manual that such shortages were not to be reported to the Police.

Inspector Fhan Shih Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that reports were made to the Police but no cognizance was taken. The Traffic staff made enquiries; sometimes a case of this nature was reported and was registered if the Police suspected that an offence had been committed, but it usually remained undetected. Generally such offences were not registered at railway police stations.

The Sind Police work according to the Bombay District Police Manual.

Punjab.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General, stated that shortages of goods from consignments were reported to the Police but much time elapsed between the detection of the shortage by the railway and the report to the Police. He would like to get reports of shortages as they occurred. He proposed a clearing house run by police offices—for their own information where shortage reports and excess goods reports would be tabulated. By means of this tabulation the Police would at once be able to discover whether shortages or losses were occurring from any particular station or district. This clearing house would be located in the office of the Assistant Inspector-General, Railway Police.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that reports were seldom made; when reports were received they were registered and investigated if *prima facie* there was reason to suspect the commission of a cognizable offence.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that reports were not made to the Police for enquiry, that intimation of shortages was seldom received and action was only taken when there was reason to suspect the commission of a theft—*vide* paragraph 17 of Agent's Circular No. VI of 1891. The Claims Department dealt with such cases.

Rule 27(2) of the Punjab Police Rules states that it is not the business of the Railway Police to intervene in cases of shortage or missing goods unless they have reason to suspect the commission of a cognizable offence.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that reports were not as a rule made to the Police. If reports were made cognisance was not taken unless a clear case of theft was established. Inquiries were made by the Traffic Department in such matters, *vide* paragraph 17 of Traffic Manager's Circular No. 6 of 1891, Appendix A embodied in the North-Western Railway Traffic Manual.

Rule 26 (vii) of the North-West Frontier Province Police Rules state that the Railway Police shall not be required to intervene in cases of shortage or missing goods unless they have reason to suspect the commission of a cognizable offence.

Question No. 7.—How far is such pilferage, as takes place, due to the act or connivance of the railway staff?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, mentioned that an experienced railway official of high standing recently told him that he believed that as much as seventy-five per cent. of the thefts were the work of the railway staff, and his own experience was that a large number of such pilferages was the work of members of the railway. He believed that the Police were also responsible to a certain extent. More than one case had come to his knowledge in which the Railway Police were undoubtedly in connivance with the Railway staff.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that cases of seals being tampered with almost always occurred at the despatching station. They might also occur at destinations, when the Police were not present to watch the unloading. It was quite possible that the police connived at these thefts, though no concrete case had come to his knowledge.

Mr. Acock, District Superintendent of Police, stated that pilferages, apart from thefts, were committed in cent. per cent. cases with the connivance of the railway staff. He did not know who committed them at the transshipment yards, but he thought that they were specially done by coolies, and possibly by outsiders. He had frequently had cases in which shunters shunted wagons to the dead end, where the pilferage occurred.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that all pilferage from seal-intact wagons was done by the railway staff, usually the *palladars*, except those cases in which grain bags were cut by a knife pushed through the door hinges, a few of which were done by outsiders. Pilferages from goods sheds and platforms were mostly done by the railway staff, only a small amount being done by outsiders.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that about ninety per cent. of the cases from booked consignments were done by the staff and, with their connivance, by coolies and *palladars* who were not actually railway servants but were employed on the contract system.

Inspector Macleod stated that about ninety per cent. of the pilferages were committed by the railway staff. Police subordinates got chances of assisting, although ordinarily the Police did not do much patrolling in goods sheds.

Inspector Murphy thought that practically all pilferages were done by the railway staff in which term he included menials, watchmen, *palladars*, porters, shunting porters, etc.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that the majority of such pilferages as took place were the work of railway staff and *palladars*, and were due in a great measure to what was known as "handling money" on railways, *i.e.*, money paid as wages for labour in loading and unloading consignments at goods sheds. This allowance once paid to the Station Master and Goods Clerk was not accounted for or audited with the result that no register for labour employed was maintained by the staff and the system degenerated into either one of *begar* or free rather than forced labour, or merchants themselves were put to the expense of doing their own loading and unloading. This meant that *palladars* were very poorly paid if paid at all, and as every labourer was worthy of his hire he helped himself, to the loss of both the Railway Company and merchants. The latter seldom complained and even if they did the railway staff had the means of making matters unpleasant for them. The remedy was obvious—better supervision and the maintenance of a duty register, which should be liable to frequent and surprise checks by responsible officials. "Handling money is at present more or less a gift to the railway staff."

Inspector Farrant stated that at least fifty per cent. of the pilferages that took place were due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Prosecuting Inspector, Kharrat Nali and Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated that everything was done with either the knowledge of the railway staff or by themselves.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shunker stated that pilferages from seal-intact wagons were almost always committed with the connivance of or by the railway staff themselves.

Bombay.

In the opinion of the witnesses railway employees were mainly responsible. In the case of running train thefts *Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent*, mentioned that railway menials such as cabin-men assisted the thieves in many ways.

Sub-Inspector Rege stated that he had secured the conviction of thirty-nine men during the year 1920 drawn from carriage examining staff, coolies, porters and even transshipment clerks. Thefts from sheds were usually due to the railway staff but not those from running trains.

Mr. Lallubhai Hargobindas, Public Prosecutor, Godhra (Panch Mahals), stated that the Watch and Ward who travelled in running goods trains were in with the thieves.

Mr. Guider, formerly Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Bombay Presidency and now Watch and Ward Superintendent, Bombay, Ba oda and Central India Railway, stated that thefts from passengers in trains or in waiting rooms were generally committed by professional travelling thieves or by travellers who succumbed to the temptations offered. Thefts from the goods shed, wagons in the yard or the parcel office in the station were committed in about 90 per cent. of the cases that occurred by railway menials and in the remaining 10 per cent. by outsiders. He thought that the clerical staff were also concerned. This was a matter of general knowledge and the charge could not be brought home particularly to any individual. It stood to reason that if pilfering went on in the goods shed, it cast a reflection on the station master's administration of the station and if it was allowed to go on, it either meant that the station master must be a fool to allow it to continue and not participate in the proceeds or that he was conniving. With regard to the suggestion that if it was so general there would be more convictions, his experience was that the railway authorities were very loath to prosecute their staff. When cases were brought to light, they said that the man had put in long service and they preferred to deal with him departmentally and so hushed up matters. In the case of a man, for instance, who deliberately short-loaded and certified that a wagon was correctly loaded and it was found out that it was short-loaded at the beginning, even if the offence were brought home to him, he was generally let off with a warning even though the railway paid heavy compensation in some instances. When the Police were responsible for guarding goods sheds, pilfering used to occur and they were responsible for a great deal.

Madras.

The witnesses were of opinion that the railway staff were mainly responsible for such cases.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent of Railway Police, Trichinopoly, in support of his opinion, stated that in 1920, thirty-eight railway menials had been convicted in his district for such offences. During the same period five policemen had been convicted and six others dismissed in connection with pilferages.

Bengal.

The witnesses were of opinion that such pilferages were entirely or almost entirely due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Mr. Ezekiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, mentioned that on one occasion he heard a station master say to a guard, "Is that all the fish that has come? What am I going to eat?" On another occasion he saw a *bhisti* stealing fish and reported the man as the station master declined to do so. On enquiry he found that the consignee gave the fish to the *bhisti*.

Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent of Railway Police, was of opinion that very frequently such thefts and pilferages were the work of the railway staff or were done with their connivance.

Inspectors Hashmutulla and Upendra Chandra Deb agreed.

Bihar and Orissa.

The witnesses were of opinion that such pilferages as took place were mostly due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, was of opinion that such pilferages were due almost entirely to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Messrs. Hurst, Mayberry, Sharif Muhammad Khan and Kaula agreed.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi was of opinion that the pilferages were wholly due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, Hyderabad, was of opinion that about seventy-five per cent. of pilferages were due to either railway employees or their connections, i.e., relations.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that if the pilferages occurred from seals-intact wagons, only the railway staff and menials (*paltudars*) could be held responsible as no one else could get at the goods.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that a very high percentage of cases was due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, thought that with the exception of actual thefts from running goods trains, pocket picking and thefts from running passenger trains other than of booked luggage, pilferage was almost entirely due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that small pilferages in goods sheds, from wagons in the yards, from parcel offices, etc., were committed by the railway staff. Pilferages of luggage from the brake-vans of passenger trains were also due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that pilferages in goods sheds and transshipment sheds of fresh fruit, liquor and fish were to a great extent due to the act or connivance of the railway staff. In other cases the railway staff were not so much concerned.

North-West Frontier Police.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that a large percentage of pilferage was due to the act or connivance of the railway staff in the lower grades.

Question No. 8.—Are cases of shortages from wagons with broken seals registered and investigated as thefts immediately on report being made?

United Provinces.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that in the United Provinces such cases were invariably registered and investigated as thefts immediately reports were made.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent of Police and Inspector Macleod agreed.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated that in cases where shortage could not be known due to the fact that there was no invoice inside the wagon or because the sealed label was broken no case was registered till this information was gathered from the despatching or the destination station.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shankar stated that usually three or four days elapsed before a wagon with broken seals was checked.

For rules see question 6.

Bombay.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General of Police, stated that as a general rule in the case of running train thefts where the door was found open it might be assumed that the theft was committed by outsiders and that therefore it was a matter of primary importance for the police to register the case immediately. Mere broken seals generally meant pilferage by the Watch and Ward. Where the doors were found shut and the goods missing the Police should not take any action unless two conditions were present: either that evidence was available to point out that an offence had been committed or that the Traffic Department had themselves investigated and accumulated summary evidence to prove where and by whom the theft was committed. That arrangement had been made with the approval and sanction of the Traffic Department of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway. The railway were apt to take the view that their responsibility ended with the report to the Police. They did not understand that enquiries into missing goods were no part of the duties of the Police. If anything was lost the Police must be blamed.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, stated cases of shortages from wagons with broken seals while standing in the yard were registered and investigated as thefts, otherwise it depended on circumstances. A broken seal of itself did not imply theft and the railway staff should take steps to satisfy themselves that a theft had occurred before reporting the shortage to be a theft. Different Superintendents had different views on the registration of these cases.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police, agreed with Mr. Holman and stated that seals could be broken by the oscillation of the train which caused the sharp edges on the rings to cut through the twine fastening the two rings together.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that such cases were not registered or investigated unless the doors, in addition, were also found open, in which case the case was taken up whether there was a shortage or not. In about 35% of cases no shortage was found.

Sub-Inspector Rege stated that where the seals were found broken in the yard the case was taken up.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, a retired Inspector of Railway Police, was of opinion that the Police should enquire into far more cases than they did.

Madras.

The witnesses stated that such cases were immediately registered and investigated as offences unless there were circumstances to prove that the broken seals were due to natural causes such as the weather, the journey, etc.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General, stated that a shortage accompanied by broken seals was not treated *prima facie* as evidence of theft and registered as such but was merely treated as a shortage. *Mr. Williams*, Superintendent of Railway Police, corroborated.

Bengal.

Yes. Inspector S. C. Banarjee stated that there was sometimes delay on the part of the railway in reporting.

Assam.

Yes; subject to the provisions of Rule 53, Chapter 2, Assam-Bengal Railway Traffic Manual.

Paragraph 53 of Assam-Bengal Railway Traffic Manual, "Reporting Thefts of Goods and Parcels to Police."

"1. Station Masters should report to the nearest police officer in charge of stations only when thefts are noticed in the following cases —

- (i) When packages are found short from wagons with *broken wagon seals*.
- (ii) When packages are noticed to be in *open* state on unloading and from the condition it is clear that such open state is due to *pilfering*. They are to be careful not to confuse open state due to ordinary damage with open state due to deliberate pilferage.
- (iii) Instances when station coolies or outsiders are actually detected in the act of pilfering from wagons or Goods Sheds.
- (iv) When goods which have been unloaded in good condition are found to be in pilfered state when making delivery, which obviously proves that the pilferage has taken place at the station.
- (v) Any cases not included in the above which are actually of a suspicious nature and if the Station Master is able to produce some proof that a pilferage or theft is likely to have taken place.

2. No reports should be sent to the Police when there are shortages in the number of packages out of a consignment, as, in most cases, this is not due to theft but to misdespatch or exchange.

3. In making reports to the Police, care should be taken to give full particulars of station from, station to, and the place where the pilferage was first noticed."

Bihar and Orissa.

Cases of shortages from wagons with broken seals are registered and investigated as thefts immediately on report being made.

Central Provinces.

Such cases are registered at once.

Hyderabad.

Yes.

Rajputana.

Yes. The Rajputana Railway Police work according to the United Provinces Police Regulations. The rules on the subject are dealt with under question 6, United Provinces.

Sind.

Yes.

Punjab.

The witnesses stated that cases of shortages from wagons with broken seals were registered and investigated as thefts immediately on report being made.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General of Police, stated that he would prefer to have every case of shortage reported. It might not be necessary to take immediate action, but the Police at any rate ought to be in a position to know the state of affairs. A sort of clearing house should be run by Police officers for their own information. Reports of shortages would be tabulated and by means of this tabulation the Police would be able to discover whether there was any series of shortages or losses occurring from any particular station or district. This clearing house would form part of the Assistant-Inspector-General's office. This system was preferable to one of monthly summaries of shortages.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Tubia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that cases of shortages from wagons with broken seals were registered and investigated as thefts immediately on report being made unless there were grounds for believing that no theft had taken place. Sometimes seals were accidentally broken or were found missing and consignments inside got torn or damaged in loading or unloading. In his experience the proportion of cases where there were shortages from wagons of which the seals had been damaged, shortage due to mistake of short-loading or cross-loading amounted to between 20 and 30 %.

Question No. 9.—What are the arrangements in force regarding seal-checking? What is the strength of the special force (if any) told off for this duty and is it carried out at all stations and out-posts where there are railway police or only at the boundaries of jurisdictions?

United Provinces.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that seal-checking was undertaken as a part of their regular duty by the Police at all junction stations, and at roadside stations where thefts from running goods train were rife.

Mr. Acock, District Superintendent of Police, stated that there was no regular force for seal-checking apart from the general force. He thought that it should be made compulsory for the Police to check seals. There was much difference of opinion on the point, but his own opinion, after eight years' experience in the Railway Police, was that by careful seal-checking alone could goods train thefts be stopped. The railway staff could not be trusted to do it. Being themselves frequently concerned in thefts, their first aim and object was to get the wagon as far away as possible before the broken seal was discovered. Guards frequently signed books without checking seals. In this connection he desired to point out that one of the greatest difficulties with which the Railway Police had to contend was the failure of the railway subordinates to carry out their duties properly, though, when the point came up, they maintained that they had carried out all orders. For instance, if a package was found missing from a broken wagon at Lucknow, the guard would say that he had checked the wagon at Shahjahanpur where he took it over, though it was notorious that many guards did not check their wagons. The Police therefore started on a totally false scent.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that on his sub-section C, there was no seal-checking, because it was found unsatisfactory. The only thing the seal-checking staff detected was a wagon without a seal. It was very difficult for them to detect a tampered seal or a lifted seal. For that kind of work literate men with some idea of seals were required. In his opinion, the District Traffic Superintendent ought to have a special wagon checking staff under him and they should be allowed to check seals whenever they thought proper and in the same manner as the Travelling Ticket Examiners did. A superior class of man was required for such work. They should also be permitted to check loaded wagons in goods sheds or transshipment sheds. This measure would put a stop to short loading and other malpractices on the part of the loading staff. At present the railway chowkidars who did seal-checking suffered from the same disability as the police constable. The guard was supposed to check seals when he took over the train, but from experience it was found that he really did not do so.

Inspector Macleod stated that the Police were supposed to check seals, but constables were not really qualified to do so.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, was of opinion that the system would never be a success and no reliance could be placed on the joint check until guards were forced to realise their responsibilities in the matter. The rules called for very much stricter attention.

Inspector Farrant did not think that seal-checking was usually carried out with great care either by the Police or by the Railway. The constable deputed to this duty generally sat down in a place where he expected the train to pass and, when it came to a stand, went to the guard and took his signature.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi doubted if the constables—illiterate as most of them were—could perform this duty satisfactorily.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated that seal-checking was seldom done although two men were kept on this work with spells of duty each at all stations where there was either a railway police station or an outpost, as well as at the boundaries of jurisdictions.

Seal-checking with the object of localizing theft is laid down as one of the duties of the Police in para. 3 (iii) of the Government Railway Police Manual United Provinces.

Bombay.

The Police only check seals when endeavouring to localize a large amount of crime occurring or where thefts take place on the borders of jurisdictions. Seal-checking is not laid down as a part of the duty of the police in the Police Manual.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, stated that trains arriving from another jurisdiction were sometimes checked with some special object in view. It was almost impossible to locate thefts without seal-checking.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that the Police checked seals only at the boundaries of jurisdictions. Theft was located by the Police by deputing patrols with goods trains at night. As regards seal breaking the Police relied entirely on the railway for reports which were seldom made.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that the Railway Police had no concern with seal-checking since "Watch and Ward" was taken over by the railways. In the event of frequent thefts the local police station officer might make temporary arrangements to check seals at stations in order to localize offences.

Sub-Inspector Rege corroborated Mr. Austin.

Madras.

The witnesses stated that the system was to depute one constable for seal-checking duty at all stations where there was a railway police station, on an average at every sixty miles of line. At troublesome places outpost men were also deputed and in specially bad stations an extra staff was employed. The witnesses were of opinion that with a view to localize thefts the system was very effective and absolutely essential. It also had the effect of keeping the Railway staff up to the mark.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, thought that seal-checking by the Police was essential.

There are no rules in the Executive Orders of the Madras Police dealing with the subject.

Bengal.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, said that seal-checking was done informally only on the border of the province and that it would be of the greatest assistance to Police investigation to have an efficient system of seal-checking by the Police. Inspector Mukharji agreed.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, stated that during the last year a few constables at Sealdah, Chitpur, Ranaghat and Naihati had been told off to check informally, but this was useless as no regular force had been sanctioned for the purpose.

Inspector S. C. Banarjee, Saidpur Section, Eastern Bengal Railway, stated that seal-checking was not done by the Police in that section.

Police Regulations, Bengal, Volume VI, Rule 75, states "The Railway Police shall not be called upon to undertake the watch and ward of railway property, and they shall not be required to intervene in cases of shortage or missing goods, or to examine the seals of goods wagons, unless they have reason to suspect the commission of a cognizable offence."

Assam.

The Police have nothing to do with seal-checking except when working on running trains.

Inspector Hashmutullah mentioned that only one head constable and ten constables were allotted to this duty in his jurisdiction.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, said that there was no objection to seal-checking by the police being laid down as one of the duties of the Railway Police if sufficient staff were allotted for the purpose.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent of Railway Police, Patna, stated that a special force of 2 Sub-Inspectors and 2 constables from Bengal and 2 Sub-Inspectors and 2 constables from Bihar and Orissa was sanctioned for seal-checking work on the main line and a similar special force for the Grand Chord Line of the East Indian Railway. This staff was located on the provincial border between Bihar and Bengal. Similar arrangements would be made for the boundary between Bihar and the United Provinces. At present 2 constables from Bihar and 2 constables from the United Provinces under a head constable from the latter province checked seals at Dildarnagar on the main line. The ideal system would be to have these seal-checking centres at the railway station just on the boundary line between the two provinces, but that was not possible as goods trains did not stop at those stations, viz., Mihijam and Chausa on the main line and Mugma and Karmanasa on the Grand Chord Line. Seal-checking was only carried out at provincial boundaries and not at all stations where there were Railway Police. At present it was done as a temporary measure at Buxar, Dinapur, Mokameh, Kiul, Jhajha, Jhorparan Block Hut and Jamalpore. Seal-checking should be made one of the regular duties of the Railway Police.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent of Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that there were no arrangements in force regarding seal-checking in his jurisdiction, except that 2 constables of the regular force were deputed at the boundaries of the Madras Presidency and the Central Provinces. They were illiterate and unable to maintain any register. The Governments of the two provinces were addressed with a view to establishing a system similar to that in force on the East Indian Railway, but the Superintendents of Police concerned reported that their

respective Governments would not sanction the force proposed. Constables were at times deputed to stations where an increase of crime had occurred. No satisfactory results could be obtained by the employment of officers below the rank of Sub-Inspector.

Inspector Inder Sen Suchar stated that localization of crime was one essential step before a case could be detected. Seal-checking was sometimes adopted by the Railway Police as a preventive measure but as there was no regular staff sanctioned for the purpose it could not be a permanent arrangement.

Inspector Fauzdar Narayan Kuar was of opinion that seal-checking should be made a regular duty of the Police but staff should be provided for the purpose.

Rule 469, Bihar and Orissa Police Manual, lays down that the Railway Police shall not be called upon to undertake the watch and ward of railway property, and they shall not be required to intervene in cases of shortage or missing goods or to examine the seals of goods wagons, unless they have reason to suspect the commission of a cognizable offence.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that seal-checking was done entirely by the railway staff.

Messrs. Mayberry, Sharif Mohammad Khan, Mazhar Naqi and Baij Nath Kaula agreed.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, stated that seal-checking was ordinarily done by the railway staff. The Police were sometimes employed when there was an outbreak of thefts from wagons arriving with broken seals. It was not a police duty, but was done to help in localizing the commission of crime. There was no extra staff sanctioned for this class of work.

Inspector Glackan stated that seal-checking by the Police was only done at Barhanpur out-post where Khandwa Station-house jurisdiction terminated and Bhasawal Police jurisdiction commenced.

There are no rules in the Manual dealing with this subject.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, Hyderabad, stated that the strength of the Police seal-checkers was 21. They were constables and drew an allowance of Rs. 2 per mensem. They were stationed at all starting and engine-changing stations except at Shahabad, on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway where a halt of some 6 or 8 hours invariably occurred. It was their duty to check the seals of all wagons and bring to the notice of the guard of the train and station staff any defective seals. Seal-checking was essential because it assisted in localizing thefts. It enabled the Police to tell with a certain amount of accuracy where the theft had occurred.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General of Police, stated that seal-checking as a system had been abandoned in his jurisdiction, though it was carried on in a desultory fashion when men were available. Systematic checking was only done where the railway entered the Rajputana jurisdiction. Seal-checking was most useful in localizing crime, but in order to carry out this duty systematically throughout the jurisdiction some addition to the staff would be required. A system of seal-checking should be instituted and should form one of the regular duties of the Police. In order to be able to investigate, a theft had first to be localized. If that could not be done it was very difficult to investigate. When he was in the Railway Police in Lucknow he had experience of a very systematic series of thefts. At first the Police were entirely at a loss to understand where the shortages occurred because no regular seal-checking was done. It was on account of seal-checking that the Police were able to detect the gangs at work.

The Rajputana Railway Police work according to the United Provinces Government Railway Police Manual.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that seal-checking was observed only at the boundaries of jurisdictions; a force of about 30 men was employed on the duty, but they were not specially sanctioned for the purpose.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali considered that the force deputed was inadequate. The Railway Police of each thana accompanied the train up to the end of their jurisdiction. The seals were not checked at all stations or at outposts, but at certain seal-checking stations fixed by police officers.

The Sind Police work according to the Bombay District Police Manual.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that seal-checking was only carried out by the Railway Police at provincial boundaries except in the case of epidemics when it was employed to localize crimes on the sections affected. No special force was allotted for this occasional duty, the men when required being drawn from the Central Investigating Agency.

The primary object of seal-checking was to localize running goods train thefts. It was however a very dilatory method. If seal-checking were employed at every station, which at any rate for traffic reasons was not possible, even then there would be a problematic stretch of line 5 to 9 miles in length within which it would be impossible to say definitely where the case had occurred. Having localized a theft within these particular limits the Police would have to take a trolley to look for tracks where the bags had been thrown off and having found the place they would begin to follow up the traces. Running goods train thieves were very prompt. They had camels and bullocks waiting by the side of the line to take off their stuff and the first thing they did was to remove all incriminating marks such as the Railway marking on sacks. In the Punjab, unless the Police could immediately start enquiries into cases of theft from running goods trains, there was practically no chance of working out a case so that what was really wanted was better preventive measures with better detection. The Punjab Railway Police had worked out cases of thefts from running goods trains recently by means of observation patrols and had in that way broken up two gangs, one in Hissar and the other in the Ferozepur Section.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that seal-checking was carried out by the Railway Police at provincial boundaries and not at stations and outposts. No special force was allotted for this duty: for instance, there was one man at Sialkot. A goods train had on an average 70 wagons. The train stopped for 10 minutes to take water there. The number of men and the time available were insufficient to ensure a satisfactory check.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that seal-checking was performed (a) at provincial boundaries and (b) when there was necessity to localize crime.

Rule 2-7 (2) of the Punjab Police Rules lays down that it is not the business of the Railway Police to undertake the watch and ward of railway property, and they should not be required to intervene in cases of shortage or missing goods or to examine or check the seals of goods wagons unless they have reason to suspect the commission of a cognizable offence.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talib Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that no special force was told off for this duty. Four constables taken from the strength of the police stations concerned performed seal-checking duties at the border stations of Khairabad, Khushalgarh and Isakhel. At times when thefts increased seal-checking as a temporary measure was also done at other important stations such as Peshawar City, Nowshera, Kohat and Bannu. He was in favour of making seal-checking a regular duty of the Police.

Rule 2-6 (vii) of the North-West Frontier Province Police Rules states that it is not the business of the Railway Police to undertake the watch and ward of railway property, and they shall not be required to intervene in cases of shortage or missing goods or to examine or check the seals of goods wagons, unless they have reason to suspect the commission of a cognizable offence.

Question No. 10.—Are Railway Police sent out at night with goods trains for the purpose of Watch and Ward? If so, please furnish brief particulars of the arrangements so, made. If not, what measures are taken to prevent thefts from goods trains.

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that Railway Police were sent out at night with goods trains for the purpose of Watch and Ward only in exceptional circumstances. Such assistance would be given more freely if the staff were available. His experience in Rajputana was that thefts from running goods trains were far more frequent on the metre-gauge trains than on the broad-gauge because of the greater speed at which broad-gauge trains travelled and the greater difficulty of boarding wagons.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that when there was an outbreak of running train thefts, he used to send a guard of one head constable and four constables or more which travelled up and down a particular area. The guard got into the brake-van or an empty wagon and got out to patrol when the train drew up in a siding.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent of Railway Police, stated that the Police were not supposed to send a force out at night with goods trains, as it was the duty of the Watch and Ward, but when an outbreak of running train thefts occurred, the Police had to adopt this measure for their own sake. The Police were held to blame, so men who could be ill-spared from other duties had to be deputed to protect goods trains. Many constables had recovered property for the Railway Companies by watching the side of the line while they sat in the brake-vans looking out for bags being thrown out of a wagon further up the train. They either jumped out or came back directly the train stopped at the next station and drove off or captured the thieves. The trouble was that there was no communication between the brake-van and the engine on goods trains. The driver rarely looked back, so signals with the guard's lamp were not noticed and the train went on a long way after the theft occurred.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that armed constables were sent with goods trains when there was reason to believe that thefts were occurring in a particular locality. The duty was not laid down in the Manual. Special measures by posting men at

certain stations where thefts were likely to take place were adopted. Sending armed constables in brake-vans had had very good results. In several cases property that had been thrown out had been recovered.

Inspector Murphy stated that there was no special arrangement until an outbreak of crime occurred when as many constables as could be spared were sent to the stations where the thefts were being committed and the men inspected each goods train in addition to doing seal-checking duty.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that Railway Police were sent out at night with goods trains for the purpose of Watch and Ward as far as the undermanned state of the staff permitted. Each Government Railway Police Division had its own peripatetic armed guard consisting of one head constable and four constables provided with muskets and buck-shot ammunition borrowed from the District Police and also with spears. These guards were deputed to accompany night goods trains on sections where thefts were numerous and had met with much success. They had also proved successful in making surprise raids in yards. The railway authorities could do more by co-operating in the matter by allowing a train accompanied by Police to halt in a suspected locality or by placing loaded wagons near the brake-van in which the Police travelled. A great reduction in the number of running goods train thefts could be effected if the railway used some discrimination in marshalling trains, *i.e.*, if they ran complete trains of merchandise wagons and did not attach them as at present indiscriminately to coal trains. On the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, traffic was not uniform and there were only 10 wagons of merchandise to every 30 wagons of coal. If it was desired to run a whole train of goods other than coal they would have to wait for a week, whereas on the East Indian Railway they had got uniform traffic and they could easily run these trains separately. The present large number of coal trains run on the East Indian Railway to which merchandise wagons were attached precluded any sustained efforts being made by the Police to guard them in transit. Responsible railway guards should be armed and selected to accompany these trains over crime-infected lengths. Both these suggestions had been put before the railway but had been rejected, the former as impracticable and the latter as assuming the duties of the Police. "An extended use of these armed travelling police guards is justified from the results obtained."

Inspector Farrant stated that armed guards were sent out with goods trains when thefts were prevalent on a particular length of line. Armed guards also patrolled and lay in ambush at places where thefts from goods trains were prevalent in order to try to catch the thieves red-handed.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi stated that the practice had proved successful in many cases.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated the practice of sending out constables by night trains had been tried but proved a failure as in the darkness they failed to see what was going on.

Bombay.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General, was of opinion that ordinarily the guarding of goods trains whether in motion or standing was not a part of law and order duties, but that when organised attacks were made on goods trains it was the duty of the police to take preventive and detective action. When the cadre of the Railway Police was fixed as a result of the recommendations of the Police Commission of 1903 no provision was made for this duty. In dealing with outbreaks of running train thefts additional police were required and the question arose who was to pay. His contention was that logically the guarding of goods trains in motion was a part of "Watch and Ward," and it would follow that if additional police had to be employed because the Railway Company could not discharge their duty on account of organised attacks, it was not unreasonable that the Company should pay at least that part of the cost that could not be saddled upon the villagers. He would place the Railway Company in the position of a private individual asking for protection. Railway Companies did not appear to take proper care of the goods in their charge during transit in running trains. Wagons should invariably be covered and some device for rendering access by thieves difficult should be adopted and its universal use in India made compulsory. The Railway Police recently had had to send out armed men. Muskets had been borrowed from the District Police and forty per cent. of the force was now armed. The cadre, however, only provided for six armed men.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, stated that police were not sent out at night except when the looting of goods trains became a matter of frequent occurrence. In such circumstances, police were sent out in addition to patrol gradients.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, said that an escort of one head constable and four constables was sent with each train when the men were available. A large number of trains travelled without such an escort and the Railway Police had to rely on the co-operation of the District Police to find out the bad characters operating. Running train thefts were principally the work of different gangs and the Railway Police also relied on informers for information.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that when thefts from running goods train became frequent armed police parties were sent out on goods trains and also on foot to the

affected area. Owing to scarcity of men, however, all goods trains could not be provided with an armed escort. The strength of the escort varied with the length of the train and the area concerned. A considerable increase of staff was required.

Sub-Inspector Rege corroborated *Mr. Austin*.

Madras.

The witnesses stated that the practice was to send out two Railway Police constables per train with goods trains when thefts became frequent. Patrols were also employed at known bad spots.

Mr. Hanaynpton, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, considered that the police so deputed would be more effective if armed as in some localities the thieves operated in large gangs.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, declared emphatically that the patrols must be armed as that was the only way to put down running train thefts.

Bengal.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent of Railway Police, Howrah, said that this was done only on those sections of his district where thefts were frequent.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent of Railway Police, Sealdoh, stated that on his section no Police were sent out with goods trains and no measures were taken to prevent thefts. In his opinion railways were responsible for carrying goods until they made them over to the consignees and it was desirable that the responsibility should rest on the Watch and Ward.

Inspector D. N. Mukharji stated that train guards were not sent. When thefts became frequent the Railway Police instituted patrols.

Inspector S. C. Banarji, of the Saidpur Section, Eastern Bengal Railway, stated that ordinarily Railway Police were not sent out at night with goods trains but when an outbreak of crime occurred train guards were deputed and patrols were sent out. No special force was sanctioned for the duty. The men were taken from the platform staff.

Assam.

Not always—only when circumstances such as repeated thefts on a certain length of the line or at a certain hour of night or in any particular train call for action. Then one or two constables are generally deputed. They remain in the brake-van with the guard at the rear or sometimes in the centre and sometimes in the front of the train. At halting stations and shunting and watering stations these constables get out and patrol the train—especially on the offside.

Inspector Hashmatullah stated that he had 1 head constable and 10 constables for this duty which was an inadequate force.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent of Railway Police, Patna, stated that recently constables had been sent out on moonlight nights with some goods trains. They travelled in the brake-van and kept a look-out on both sides. Theft generally occurred while goods trains were travelling up steep inclines at slow speed. When constables saw bags being thrown out they jumped out of the train and lay in ambush near the bags and when the culprits came to remove the loot they arrested them or at any rate saw them close enough to be able to identify them. About 35 persons had been arrested in that way and convicted within the last few months. He did not think it would be advisable to make this arrangement a permanent rule as it would then become a routine matter and constables would go to sleep.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent of Railway Police, Khargpur, and the other witnesses stated that the same arrangements as mentioned by *Mr. Ezechiel* were maintained in their jurisdictions.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that Railway Police were not ordinarily sent out at night with goods trains for the purpose of Watch and Ward but special preventive measures were taken when occasion demanded it.

Messrs. Hurst, Mayberry, Glacken, Sharif Mohammad Khan, Sub-Inspector Mazhar Waqi and Baijnath Kaula agreed.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, Hyderabad, stated this was not done as a practice but only when thefts were prevalent; on such occasions a constable travelled from one engine-changing station to another.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that this duty had been stopped for about a year, but on the outbreak of running goods train thefts, two armed constables

invariably accompanied goods trains and this arrangement had good results. Train guard constables were of no use unless there was a head constable over them and even head constables were not altogether satisfactory for the purposes of supervision.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi. stated that a special force was located in parties at gradients and two or more men travelled by selected goods trains. There was formerly a system of sending two constables with every goods train at night, but he had put a stop to the practice as he had found that it was productive of no good. He had come across instances of constables themselves committing thefts on the train; in one case a constable made up a false case against a man. In another case they showed that they had travelled by a train which never ran in order to make travelling allowance. Another point was that being at the end of a line of 70 wagons the constables could not see far ahead. There was no brake-van in the centre of the train. Putting men into the engine would lead to trouble with the Loco. Department. Men under special Sub-Inspectors were sent in charge of some selected trains. This practice had been found more effective. He was against constables travelling with goods trains as they were practically uncontrolled and there was no knowing whether they travelled or not. Perhaps this lack of control was due to the fact there was only one gazetted officer on the line.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that two constables were sent at night with goods trains, which consisted of 70 or 80 wagons. They checked the seals but the train being a big one they could not manage to make the system effective. One head constable and 4 constables should be deputed and a brake-van should also be attached to the middle of the train. The head constable should be made responsible.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that the Railway Police were not regularly employed on running goods trains. When epidemics of crime occurred special patrols from the Central Investigating Agency were sent on trains to locate it and follow up criminals. In such cases look-out men were posted on the engine, a party in the middle of the train and a party in the rear, the latter two parties being supplied with electric torches and signal lamps. When thieves were observed signals were made to the look-out men who asked the driver to stop the train. The patrols then descended and took steps to rescue the property stolen and to capture the thieves.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that when crime prevailed in epidemic form on any section of the line, men from the force under his control were told off for night armed patrols with goods trains supervised by Station House Officers. Ordinarily no permanent patrols were sent out at night with goods trains.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that the Railway Police were sent out from the Central Investigating Agency only in special cases.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that ordinarily Railway Police were not sent out at night with goods trains for the purpose of Watch and Ward, but only when thefts increased or when the breaking of seals became frequent. During the five years that he was in charge, such occasions had been very rare.

Question No. 11.—Are head constables and constables deputed as train guards with all night trains for the protection of passengers and their property? If so, what is the system in force? How many men are employed and for how many hours are they so employed? Is the system effective?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that practically every passenger train that ran at night had a train guard. At present one constable was sent with each train. A proposal was made in 1917 to increase the number to one head constable and two constables. The proposal was accepted by the Local Government, but was not sanctioned by the Government of India. He was not quite convinced that increasing the number of guards would do much to prevent thefts in passenger trains. The guard was supposed to move about in the train and to come out on to the platform during halts, so as to keep a watch on passengers and luggage. In practice they could not move about to prevent thefts to any appreciable extent. Their duty, on an average, was not more than six hours.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that at present the strength was too low to allow of more than one constable travelling with all night trains, but a single man was not sufficient protection. In night trains there should be three men—two constables and one head constable—so that the entire length of the train would be protected. They should wear uniform. The duty should not be more than two hours at a stretch, as longer hours

induced negligence on the part of the train guards. Men could not be kept awake at night indefinitely.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, stated that one constable was sent with each night train and the men had done good work in many instances, but it was absolutely necessary to have at least two men with each train, one in uniform and one in plain clothes.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent of Railway Police, stated that one constable was no good at all. The present hours were too long. One head constable and two constables should accompany every important passenger train at night. If there was one man only, that man should travel in uniform, but if two could be sent, one man might go in plain clothes.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that train guards were sent with passenger trains. One man was not sufficient with bad lighting.

Inspector Macleod did not consider that the present system of train guards was effective, because only one constable travelled, and being always in uniform, the thieves who were professionals could easily identify him and give him a wide berth. More than one man was wanted and also men in plain clothes.

Inspector Murphy thought that the practice of sending one constable worked well and went a long way towards preventing crime, but one man was not sufficient. He himself had always sent two men and had always found them on the alert.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent of Railway Police, Agra, stated that the system was ineffective as it was beyond argument that a solitary constable could hardly be expected to protect a long train. The modern railway thi f was an adept at his work. It had been found necessary to double and even treble train guards. Instances were on record where an astute train thief had been able to exploit 1st and 2nd class passengers. A complete change was necessary. One head constable and two constables should travel with all night passenger trains, one head constable and one constable being in uniform and the other constable in plain clothes. Men with detective ability should be selected for the duty. The head constable should carry a book of First Information reports in order to be able to record complaints at first hand and to make them over to the first police station the train stopped at. The guard should be given reserved accommodation in the train and rules should be drawn up allowing for close co-operation between the railway guard and the head constable in charge of the train guard. The latter should be given carriage keys to permit of doors on the off-side of trains being locked when considered necessary. The question was an important one in view of the increase of thefts from upper class passengers and the fact that in certain provinces the deputation of such train guards was considered unnecessary.

Inspector Farrant agreed with Mr. Sharpe in believing that the system was not effective, because it was impossible for one constable to guard a whole train.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi was of opinion that the present arrangements were not altogether satisfactory. There should be at least two men deputed for each train, one to guard the platform side and the other the off-side.

Sub-Inspector Pezrey Shanker stated that the system did to a certain extent prevent offences in running passenger trains but was not very effective as one constable could hardly be expected to get out at every station and keep an eye on the whole train. There should be one head constable and three constables on each night passenger train. They should be allotted to a particular train in a particular section continuously for a period of say six months by which arrangement they would be able to mark down suspected travellers.

Bombay.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, stated that one constable was sent in *mufti* with each passenger train at night. When he was in the Railway Police he used to send one head constable and two or three constables together by selected trains. A single constable, however, was of little use unless he was a very good man. As another preventive measure he used to post men in plain clothes on the off-side of passenger trains. Constables deputed for this work should travel in *mufti*.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that in his district one constable travelled with each night passenger train. About twelve constables were employed on this duty, each man doing about six hours' duty at a time. The system, however, was not working satisfactorily.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, said that one constable accompanied each passenger train at night. No head constables were employed. The hours of duty were between four to eight hours at a time. If more men were available the system could be made more effective by increasing the number of passenger train guards to two or even three. It was very difficult for one man to watch a long overcrowded passenger train successfully.

Inspector Bird stated that on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway one constable travelled with every night train. He was on duty for a month and did not get a night in bed the whole time.

Sub-Inspector Rege stated that it was impossible for one man to carry out this duty efficiently. Three or four constables were required to watch both sides of the train. Thefts on passenger trains occurred spasmodically. If a man were caught, thieving at that particular place thieving there was suspended, the thieves directing their activities in another direction.

Madras.

The witnesses stated that one constable was sent in *muffi* by all mail trains in addition to the beat constable in uniform. On ordinary trains one constable always travelled. When thefts were frequent in any particular train extra plain-clothes men were deputed and a sub-inspector and a head constable also frequently travelled.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General, was of opinion that one constable was sufficient on ordinary passenger trains as there was the local police constable at every station to assist him if necessary. The average run for a constable was about sixty miles which took four hours.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, stated that these men were designated as "Travelling Staff" and in his district they numbered 213 out of a total force of 683. The period of duty varied according to the length of the run but did not exceed seven hours at a time and the men had a period of rest before their return journey. The system had been found very effective.

Bengal.

No staff is provided.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, was of opinion that this should be done. He had experimented with success in 1918 in consequence of running train thefts from passengers. He sent a Sub-Inspector with three constables or a head constable with two constables with each night train with instructions to keep a special watch on the off-side and to look out for men getting from one compartment to another or behaving in a suspicious manner. This should be made permanent. It would have prevented Colonel Tunell's murder.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General of Police, did not agree with Mr. Bradley's suggestion. The practice had been abolished since the institution of the Detective Department. If the Detective Department thought necessary they could put on train guards. The old system was not a success. An officer or a head constable should be sent out with the constables.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, said that when possible constables were sent occasionally in important trains from police stations and also by the Detective Department. Their instructions were to change compartments as much as possible.

Inspector D. N. Mukharji agreed with Mr. Bradley that a staff for this duty was necessary. At least one head constable and four constables were required for each train.

Inspector S. C. Banarji, of the Saidpur Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway, stated that there was no staff for this duty on the section. Some men from the platform staff were sent with one or two of the important trains to watch for bad characters. They were on duty from six to ten hours but the system was not effective as the staff was inadequate.

Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that 18 constables and 2 head constables were allotted for passenger train guards for the whole of the Assam-Bengal Railway. They were sent out singly or in pairs as far as possible with all night trains. They never had more than six to eight hours' duty. They were ordered to change carriages once in every two hours. They travelled in uniform. There was not much use in sending a single constable. Unless there was a head constable to supervise them they merely went to sleep. Good supervision was essential. A scheme for the provision of patrols on the Assam-Bengal Railway was prepared in the year 1909 which provided for a force of 26 constables (22 working and 4 reserve). No provision for supervising staff was made. The proposals were approved by Government in 1911. After the system had been in force for about 2½ years the Superintendent of Railway Police reported, suggesting certain improvements:—(a) Employment of literate constables possessing more than average intelligence and specially trained in detective work. (b) Special arrangements for supervision of patrol staff. (c) Co-operation between the District and Railway Police by deputation of District constables to important Railway stations. (d) District Police Sub-Inspectors to be sent to the Railway Police for training in Railway Police work.

Suggestions (c) and (d) were given effect to. With regard to the other two, the Inspector-General considered that further expense on patrol work was not justified. The patrol constables were sent out in plain clothes. At the Conference held in 1916 it was found that the number of running train thefts during the previous four years was too small to necessitate the employment of so large a force for patrol duty alone and the strength was reduced. Two head constables however were sanctioned for supervision. The Commissioner, Chittagong, suggested in 1917 that patrols should be put in uniform and that the patrol force should be amalgamated with the thana police and patrol work given to the thana constables in rotation. The Superintendent of Railway Police and the Agent to the Railway agreed to the suggestion in consequence of a complaint made

by the European Association drawing attention to certain cases of violence on running trains.

Inspector Hashmatullah stated that the men on the travelling staff were interchanged with thana staff weekly.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that there was no regular system of sending constables and head constables as train guards with all night trains. When cases occurred on any particular train one or two constables were deputed to travel by it, as for instance on the Main Line 17 Up—a constable left Buxar by 20 Down at 3 P.M. and arrived at Dinapore at 6-30 P.M. He started as a train guard from Dinapore by 17 Up at 0-35 and arrived at Buxar at 3-55 A.M. On the Grand Chord Line two constables travelled as train guards by 13 Up, leaving Gomoh at 10-22 P.M. and arriving at Gujhandi at 2-22 A.M. Here they left the train and got into 14 Down leaving Gujhandi at 3-15 A.M. and arriving at Gomoh at 6-55 A.M. On the Loop Line one constable travelled by 9 Up leaving Sahebganj at 2-14 A.M. and arriving at Bhagalpore at 4-8 A.M., where he was relieved by a Bhagalpore constable who travelled to Jamalpur arriving there at 5-57 A.M. So far no theft had been reported from any train on which a constable had been travelling as a night guard.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that the same procedure was adopted but the results were poor.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that it was desirable that a force should be sanctioned for this duty. Head constables on trains should record First Information Reports.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that ordinarily one constable was sent as a train guard with all night passenger trains and was on duty roughly for six to eight hours. This was probably a useful preventive measure. One man was not so useful, but the matter was purely a question of strength. The men were sent in uniform. An attempt was made to send them in *mufti* but it was found that their work could not be checked and passengers did not know whether a policeman was on the train or not. The ideal would be to send half the men in uniform and half in *mufti*, but there were not sufficient men to carry that idea out. It was all a question of strength and expenditure.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, stated that the system would be more effective if the patrols were increased in strength.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that the systems would be more effective if a better class of patrol constable was available.

Inspector Glackan stated that the system was not effective but might be rendered so if three constables were deputed as train guards instead of one.

Inspector Sharif Mohamad Khan stated that the system was not very effective, but was essential for purposes of investigation. One man was really required in each compartment. They were supposed to change compartments frequently and to keep look-out for bad characters.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Nagi stated that the system as far as detection was concerned had not proved successful but for prevention had been found useful.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula stated that though the system was not effective for the prevention of crime it had helped in the investigation.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that a constable known as the train guard constable travelled with all mail and passenger trains during the day and night. The constables travelled in plain clothes and moved about from one 3rd class carriage to another; took the signatures of the police at different stations *en route*; and performed from 8 to 10 hours' duty at a time. The system was effective but it would be more satisfactory if head constables were employed on this important duty. There was an advantage in *mufti* because the man could move about from carriage to carriage without the thief knowing him. Policemen travelling thus should not escape the notice of their own officers. A single man could do a great deal because there were one or more constables at each station; in fact in only 40 out of 157 stations was there only 1 constable. The train constable could always get assistance from the station constables.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that head constables and constables were deputed as train guards with all night trains for the protection of passengers and their property. One constable in uniform and one in plain clothes accompanied every passenger train. Not more than four constables from each Police station were so employed and were not on duty for more than eight hours at a stretch. A head constable was also deputed to check

their work and move about with passenger trains at night, but this was not found to be of much use. Passengers often complained that train guards could have rendered help but did not do so.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that constables were sent with all passenger trains; in addition head constables and constables in plain clothes were deputed to travel with passenger trains at night. About 30 men were employed on this duty, though they were not specially sanctioned for this work. Owing to want of quarters an efficient system of duties and reliefs could not be devised. The constables arrived in the morning; they wandered about during the day and came back by the night train to headquarters. When introducing the system he was very much in favour of arranging duties according to the runs of guards, but the scheme could not be put into operation as there were no quarters at Karachi and at other stations where the force could be given a whole day and night's rest. The present system was more or less effective. Accommodation however should be reserved for travelling policemen as was done for electric fitters on trains. At present a constable who alighted at a station to do his work either had to fight for a seat or travelled in a higher class. His kit was left unprotected and these disadvantages operated against the performance of his duties. He did not think that the provision of accommodation for police guards on trains made it very much easier for them to sleep on duty. As regards the statement that thieves would know where the Police were the same remark applied to the Police at district police stations.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that the force should be strengthened. The constable was on duty during the run of the train through the jurisdiction of the police station to which he was attached.

Punjab.

Mr. Strad, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that two foot constables were deputed with every night train and one head constable supervised two such patrols. Sergeants also patrolled twice a week on night trains. Station house officers shared in the supervision of these train patrols. At the present moment a force of 47 head constables and 178 constables were provided for night train duty. The constables and head constables patrolled all night and slept during the day. No man remained on patrol duty for more than one month at a time. The system was reasonably effective and would be more so when a reserved compartment was obtained for the use of these patrols. At present the men descended at stopping stations to watch the rear and off-sides of trains, but frequently found their seats occupied when the train started again. The Agent, North-Western Railway, had been requested to provide the Railway Police with compartments duly labelled on night trains. The men employed on this duty always travelled in uniform. Formerly they travelled in *mufti*, but since the occurrence of a case in which a Railway Police constable was accused of rape the orders had been altered. The constable in that case was not in uniform and it was because of that fact and also because there was no reserved accommodation on the train that it was possible for him to secure the opportunity of committing rape.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that two constables were deputed with each night passenger train on the main lines and one head constable occasionally supervised the patrol. One constable was sent for patrol work on branch lines; the duty averaged six hours per beat. The system of utilizing a uniformed force was satisfactory but there was one defect in that no accommodation was provided in the trains for the force employed on night patrol duty.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that only one Railway Police constable was deputed as a patrol constable with every night train and with some day trains. As a special measure after the unfortunate holding up of the 2 Down Calcutta Mail at Jehangira Road during Christmas week in 1913, armed District Police guards of one head constable, and eight or ten foot constables travelled with each night train in the province. They were deputed with intent to repel armed attacks and did not specially look after the safety of passengers' luggage. Each night passenger train should carry one head constable in uniform, and two constables, one in uniform and one in plain clothes. The constable in *mufti* would be able to check the activities of suspicious persons more easily and dog their steps from carriage to carriage with more chance of catching them red-handed. During the time a train was halting at a station, the constable in uniform should patrol on the off-side. The hours of duty should not exceed six hours at a time and they should have a day off after such duty.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, was of opinion that electric side lights on passenger trains were essential.

Question No. 12.—Are such guards deputed with day trains?

United Provinces.

No.

Bombay.

No.

Madras.

One beat constable travels by every passenger train day and night.

Bengal.

No.

Assam.

No.

Bihar and Orissa.

Day guards are not deputed on the East Indian Railway and Bengal and North-Western Railway but are deputed in special circumstances on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Central Provinces.

Not ordinarily. Mr. Hurst stated that they traveled on mail trains.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

No.

Rajputana.

No. Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, did not think that such deputation would be of any use.

Sind.

Yes, one constable on every train.

Punjab.

No.

North-West Frontier Province.

With some day trains.

Question No. 13.—Are cases of forged currency notes received at stations or in cash offices, registered by the railway police? If not, how are such cases dealt with?

United Provinces.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that cases were registered under the Indian Penal Code. Cases were not received in bulk, but only in isolated instances. They were primarily cases for the Criminal Investigation Department.

Mr. Fitzpatrick stated that the cases were registered as soon as a report was made, but there was great delay in reporting. In some cases three months had elapsed before the report was received.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent of Railway Police, Agra, stated that such cases were dealt with by the Railway Police under Section 489 (a) to (d), I. P. C. Belated reports, however, were received.

Bombay.

Cases are usually reported to the Criminal Investigation Department.

Madras.

Cases are usually reported to the Criminal Investigation Department.

The Railway Police take action only when the culprit is handed over and the facts reveal a cognizable offence.

Bengal.

The notes are sent to the Criminal Investigation Department for action from the Howrah Cash Office and to the Commissioner of Police from the Sealdah Cash Office.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, stated that such cases were not detected until after presentation.

Inspector S. C. Bannerji of the Saidpur Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway, stated that if a man were caught red-handed he would be made over to the Police who would take up the case.

Assam.

They are registered if the offender is sent with the report. If detected in a Cash Office no regular criminal case is instituted until the offender has been ascertained and arrested.

Bihar and Orissa.

Cases of forged currency notes received at stations or in Cash Offices are registered by the Railway Police when reported.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that cases of forged currency notes would be registered at once if reported and would probably be dealt with by the Criminal Investigation Department.

Messrs. Hurst, Mayberry, Glackan, Sharif Mohammad Khan, Mazhar Naq and Kaula stated that they had never had experience of any such case.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

No such cases have been reported.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that such cases were rare.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that such cases were passed on to the Sind Criminal Investigation Department.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that such cases were reported to the Railway Police and were registered and disposed of according to law, but generally remained undetected as reports were received very late after the enquiry by the Railway staff had been completed.

Punjab.

Yes.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talha Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that the Railway Police did not register such cases merely on rejection of the notes as forged by the audit office. On receipt of such notes from the Railway, the Police made inquiries to ascertain if possible the person who passed such notes, a matter in which for obvious reasons they were seldom successful. Special cases were forwarded to the Criminal Investigation Department. If a report were made to them at the time an offence was committed the Railway Police registered and investigated the case.

Question No. 14.—Is there much unreported loss or crime? If so, why are reports not made?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that a considerable amount of petty crime as regards passenger trains went unreported for the reason that if reports were made the travellers would have to break journey to attend the enquiry. In petty cases they preferred to cut their losses rather than be detained. Thefts of goods were usually reported if of any magnitude.

Mr. Acock, District Superintendent of Police, did not think that there was much important crime on the railway which was not reported.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that in the case of goods sent at railway risk, there was a good deal of unreported crime because if a report was made, the railway would have to bear the brunt of the crime and pay the claim. The public did not report because they had no cause for complaint having taken delivery on a clear receipt. The railway subordinates made them sign a clear receipt before delivering goods. After delivery had been taken, the consignee did not report. If he went to court, he might be prosecuted for having made a false report. Consignees as a rule did not check consignments very carefully, and trusted the station master, or the goods clerk.

Inspector Macleod said that he did not find much aversion on the part of the public from making reports, except perhaps in the case of a passenger who had to go a very long distance and did not like the idea of being detained. Reports of goods cases especially those from transshipment sheds were not made because invariably it was the work of the staff, and the public did not like to report because they might be involved in trouble later. The public at the destination end did not report because goods were taken on clear receipt, and the consignee had no claim. Goods clerks, to cover their own shortcomings, or that of their staff, persuaded the consignees in 9 out of 10 cases to take delivery on clear receipt, that is to say, the consignees were coerced into accepting the consignments.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent of Railway Police, Agia, stated that there was a certain amount of unreported crime. Pilferages in goods or transshipment sheds were often not reported because the staff persuaded consignees to take delivery on clear receipt and the latter to avoid trouble and friction with the railway staff refrained from making reports. A further cause might be ascribed to the fact that complainants did not come forward owing to the inconvenience and expense which an investigation and attendance at court entailed. The railway magistrate more often than not was a heavily worked treasury officer and the only time he could devote to railway police cases was the late afternoon or evening and adjournments were not few in consequence. Much actual pressure was put upon merchants to give clear receipts. People had not complained to him but when he had gone to goods sheds and talked to merchants they had told him, although they would not put in a formal complaint against the Railway.

Inspector Farrant thought that there was a certain amount of unreported loss and crime. Reports were not made by the public as they did not wish to be put to the inconvenience and expense that a police enquiry and probable consequent attendance at court entailed when the property stolen was of small value or of an unidentifiable nature.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz agreed with *Inspector Farrant* and added in connection with loss and crime from goods trains and brake-vans that sometimes no information was given to the Government Railway Police by the railway staff in cases where packages were found short from seals intact wagons and matters were settled by the railway authorities without any reference to the Railway Police.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shanker stated that there was much unreported loss in respect of goods, because in cases of ordinary loss the consignees did not care to report them as they generally did not wish to offend the local subordinates of the goods shed with whom they had to deal every day, and secondly, in cases where the consignments were booked at owner's risk they knew that they could not get any satisfaction from the Railway Company.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi did not think that there was much unreported loss or crime.

Bombay.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, stated that it was only in very small amounts that the public did not make complaints.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that under the system of registration in force on that railway it was impossible to say.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, did not think there was much unreported crime.

Sub-Inspector Rege agreed with *Mr. Austin* but thought that sometimes passengers losing petty things did not report for fear of losing the train.

Madras.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, and *Inspector Doraiswami* were of opinion that the bulk of unreported crime was in connection with consignments of which delivery had been taken and the loss subsequently noticed.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, was of opinion that there was very little unreported crime. All the railway staff reported crime in order to safeguard themselves from departmental punishments. Traders also generally reported their cases.

Bengal.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, was of opinion that a considerable amount of petty pilferage was not reported. The Railway Company reported those cases in which it was expected that a claim would be preferred. *Inspector Mukharji* corroborated.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent of Railway Police, Sealdah, said that cases of pilferage of fish, vegetables and fruit were very rarely reported as the victims were afraid of reprisals. For instance, consignors from Goalundo sent fish regularly. Supposing the consignor had 5 maunds of fish to despatch he went first to the booking clerk. He knew that 5 maunds would not arrive at the destination so he paid freight for 3 maunds and gave annas eight to the goods clerk. Four maunds might reach their destination in which case the consignee paid the consignor for four maunds. He lost nothing by it nor did the consignor because he

got fish very cheap at the starting point. He allowed for pilferage on the way. If however the consignor complained, the consignment would be allowed to rot or be diverted. The consignors were therefore completely at the mercy of the Traffic staff.

Inspector S. C. Banerjee stated that as regards passengers 25% of petty losses and petty crime was not reported as passengers were unwilling to suffer detention and the consequent trouble and expense. As regards losses in connection with goods traffic more than 75% was unreported as the railway staff responsible managed to hush up such cases in order to save themselves or to save the railway from liability of paying compensation.

Assam.

The witnesses reported that there was a certain amount of unreported crime of a petty nature.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, mentioned that he had learnt from a railway official with considerable experience as Traffic Inspector that it was very considerable in amount. He had not found that there was a tendency on the part of the railway authorities to report more cases to the Police than they ought to. He would not like to have cases that were dealt with by the Claims branch reported to the Police. The railway were quite reasonable in the matter of asking the Police to make enquiries into certain cases such as missing goods cases.

Inspector Syed Hashmutullah was of opinion that the public declined to report to the Police for fear of detention and attendance at courts.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezechie, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that there was a considerable amount of unreported loss and crime. Pilferages were not reported as the owners did not want the trouble of a police enquiry and the possible inconvenience of having to attend court in case the culprit was detected and sent up for trial.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpore, stated that there was much unreported crime. Station masters endeavoured to obtain clear receipts and owners, unless the loss was heavy, preferred to grant them and take delivery of the remainder of the consignments without delay. There was a general idea among the railway staff that in the interests of the railway they should get clear receipts as frequently as possible. On the Bengal and North-Western Railway a regular statement was maintained by the District Traffic Superintendent showing the number of cases in which a station master had been successful in obtaining clear receipts and station masters were marked accordingly. That statement, however, was not maintained as an official record.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, stated that there was not much unreported crime, excepting cases of petty pilferages, in which the station masters and goods clerks and parcel clerks effected delivery of consignments under clear receipts. Passengers in order to avoid inconvenience did not report petty losses of luggage, etc.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar was of opinion that there was a considerable amount of unreported crime and mentioned the following reasons why cases were not reported:—(a) the want of knowledge on the part of the travelling public of the existence of a railway police station conveniently situated where they could lay their complaints without being interfered with in their journey or without a chance of missing their trains; (b) the absence of railway police station buildings from railway platforms which would be one of the ways of letting the public know where to complain; (c) the paucity of railway police staff with the result that even at important stations there were not sufficient constables to attend all trains on each of the platforms. It was desirable that there should be literate platform head constables attending all important trains so that they might be able to guide the public or tell them how to proceed in case they had to make a complaint; (d) the absence of any agency travelling in passenger trains which could communicate with railway police officers at different stations and ensure that cases were reported; (e) the location of railway police stations at great distances from one another. A passenger having lost by theft a small bundle of clothes did not like to spend another Rs. 2 in railway fare to go and lodge a complaint at the police station and probably be detained and lose another Rs. 20 for not being able to attend to his work. Each important passenger train should have a travelling head constable who could record any first information on the way and hand it over to the nearest police station officer for investigation making the preliminary enquiries personally till that point. As regards thefts of merchandise the chief concern of the merchants was to get a claim from the railway for the loss sustained by them and when they realised that they could not do so, having despatched their goods at their own risk, they did not desire to complain of their loss to the Police. Besides if the station masters or goods clerks had effected delivery under clear receipts in no circumstances would these merchants complain to the Police. In each railway *thana* during the month there were about 4 or 5 cases of running passenger train thefts to every 20 cases reported.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, thought that there was a great deal of unreported crime. There was not much object in reporting the loss of unidentifiable

property or that sent at owner's risk. If sent at Company's risk the owners were indifferent as they knew they would get compensation. A merchant would often sign a clear receipt in order to secure his remaining property, to save himself from the worry of an enquiry and to keep on good terms with the station staff.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, stated that petty crime to a certain extent was not reported. The property stolen was generally such as could not be identified and the owners knew that in such circumstances reporting would not benefit them.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that merchants took delivery on clear receipts in order not to incur the hostility of the station staff. This arrangement seemed to be encouraged by the Railway Company's policy. It was a sort of business arrangement as they did not like small claims being brought against them. The Railway Company tried to settle these matters amicably with the merchants. In many cases crime was not reported to the Police. The majority of these thefts were committed in the goods sheds. There were special transhipment platforms where the cases occurred.

Inspector Glacken stated that there was a certain amount of unreported crime by big merchants who would rather undergo the loss and give clear receipt to the railway than get into the bad books of the goods clerk or the parcel clerk as the case might be. A certain amount of crime was also not reported by passengers in order to avoid being inconvenienced.

Inspector Sharif Mohammed Khan stated that there was much unreported crime as complainants did not take any interest as most of their losses were made good by compensation and the Railway as far as possible tried to effect delivery on clear receipt.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi stated that a number of cases were not reported the reasons being (a) in the case of passengers the desire to avoid the inconvenience to which they were likely to be put during the investigation and prosecution period; (b) the cases in the goods sheds were not reported if the loss was small and the articles stolen were of such a nature as could not be identified and traced out or if the merchants thought that their report to the Police would bring them into bad books with the railway staff.

Sub-Inspector Bajnath Kaula also thought that there was much unreported crime because the railway staff effected delivery on a clear signature and the consignee thought that he could not claim for loss and hence made no reports to the Police.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

No.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, did not think that the percentage of unreported crime was high. Thefts from passengers were not reported when losses were not large as the sufferers had not the time to await an investigation. The Rajputana Railway Police jurisdiction was handicapped in the matter of receiving complaints because the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway would not allow Government Railway Police stations to be built on platforms.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, was of opinion that there was much unreported crime. Many passengers whose property was stolen did not report in order to avoid trouble.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali was also of opinion that there was much unreported loss and crime and that owners did not detect shortages while taking delivery; they noticed the loss at home. Their reports would therefore be useless, consequently they avoided making reports.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, was of opinion that much crime was unreported in many cases possibly owing to a doubt whether an offence or merely a misdespatch had occurred. In other cases, merchants did not worry if a sack or two was missing from a large consignment. There was always a certain amount of burking by the Railway Police, that is, they did not register cases that they should have registered, and they found arguments to prove the impossibility of doing so.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that cases were reported except in instances when passengers and the railway staff did not bring matters to the notice of the Police for action.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that there was much unreported crime because in a great number of cases the Railway staff itself was involved and also because passengers saved themselves the trouble of reporting minor losses.

North-West Frontier Provinces.

Khan Sahib Rana Tolia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that there was not much unreported loss or crime, and such cases as did occur were only instances

of small shortages and pilferages in which the consignee either could not establish his claim or considered his loss too small as compared with the amount of time he would lose or inconvenience which he would undergo if he reported the case for investigation. Passengers also abstained from making reports of petty losses from personal luggage for the same reason.

Question No. 15.—Is railway crime mostly the work of local thieves? Where do most offences occur as regards (a) passengers and their luggage, (b) goods (e.g., in stations, at goods sheds, etc.)?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, said that in his experience railway crime was chiefly the work of local thieves, a great many of whom specialised in railway work. The ordinary *badmash* could not do much unless he had the help of a railway man or railway official. Offences as regards passengers (a) occurred in station halls, and as regards (b) in goods sheds and station yards.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that thefts from (a) passengers were not entirely committed by local thieves. Professional railway thieves travelled all over a railway system or systems. Most of the offences occurred in passenger halls. As regards (b) goods thefts, these were entirely the doing of local outside thieves and the staff of *palladars* working in goods shed, and transshipment yards.

Mr. Acock, District Superintendent of Police, stated that most of the offences as regards (a) occurred in passenger halls. As regards (b), there were some sections in which there were villages that lived by running train thefts, either in British India or in Native States, as for instance, in Rampore State.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that (a) passenger train thieves travelled all over the province, some of them belonging to Bengal and some to Bombay. Theft from (b) goods trains, were the work of local thieves and in the majority of cases, took place at transshipment stations.

Inspector Mactead stated that thefts from goods sheds and yards were the work of local thieves, but those from passenger trains were generally committed by professionals.

Inspector Murphy stated that most railway crime was the work of local men, but was done with the connivance of the railway staff.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent of Railway Police, Agra, stated that crime on the railway was generally the work of local thieves working in collusion with the railway staff. With reference to the suggestion that these local thefts were often found to have been committed in collusion with the Railway Police as well, he stated that there were few such cases and it was very exceptional for the Railway Police to be in with the thieves. There certainly were cases on record, but they were few in number. Offences as regards (a) occurred at stations while the passenger was asleep and as regards (b) occurred in yards. Theft from passenger trains were as a rule the work of professional railway thieves.

Inspector Farrant agreed with Mr Sharpe in the belief that railway crime was mostly the work of local thieves acting with the connivance of the railway staff. Offences as regards (a) mostly occurred at stations and as regards (b) in yards and goods sheds.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi stated that thefts from passengers were generally committed by outsiders and those from goods sheds and stations by the railway staff in conjunction sometimes with local bad characters.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shanker agreed with Inspector Khairat Nabi and added that thefts on running goods trains were committed also by local bad characters who formed gangs and had invariably amongst them an *ex-railway* employee who could board or descend from running goods trains. Offences as regards (a) mostly occurred in trains and as regards (b) in yards and running trains.

Bombay.

The witnesses stated that Railway crime was mostly the work of local thieves. Upcountry men committed thefts in stations and passenger trains especially on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Holmon, Deputy Inspector-General :—

- (a) on platforms and in waiting rooms;
- (b) on running and stationary goods trains and in goods sheds.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent of Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway :—

- (a) chiefly on running trains;
- (b) only thefts from running goods trains were dealt with by the Police on this railway.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, and Sub-Inspector M. D. Kege :—

- (a) in stations ;
- (b) at goods sheds.

Mr. Guider, formerly Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Bombay, and now Watch and Ward Superintendent, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that thefts from passengers in trains or in waiting rooms were generally committed by professional travelling thieves or by travellers who succumbed to the temptations offered. Thefts from the goods shed, wagons in the yard or the parcel office in the station were committed in about 90 per cent. of the cases that occurred by railway menials and in the remaining 10 per cent. by outsiders. He thought that the clerical staff were also concerned. This was a matter of general knowledge and the charge could not be brought home particularly to any individual. It stood to reason that if pilfering went on in the goods shed, it cast a reflection on the station master's administration of the station and if it was allowed to go on, it either meant that the station master must be a fool to allow it to continue and not participate in the proceeds or that he was conniving. With regard to the suggestion that if it was so general there would be more convictions, his experience was that the railway authorities were very loath to prosecute their staff. When cases were brought to light, they said that the man had put in long service and they preferred to deal with him departmentally and so hushed up matters. In the case of a man, for instance, who deliberately short-loaded and certified that a wagon was correctly loaded and it was found that it was short-loaded at the beginning, even if the offence were brought home to him, he was generally left off with a warning even though the Railway paid heavy compensation in some instances. When the Police were responsible for guarding goods sheds, pilfering used to occur and they were responsible for a great deal.

Madras.

The witnesses stated that railway crime was committed mostly by local thieves.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, was of opinion that offences as regards (a) were mostly committed by pick-pockets operating at the booking office window and as regards (b) mostly occurred in goods sheds and yards.

Inspector Doraiswami stated that offences as regards (a) occurred during the night and as regards (b) in stations.

Bengal.

The witnesses were of opinion that railway crime was mostly the work of local thieves, but thefts from running trains were the work of outsiders.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, and Inspector D. N. Mukherji were of opinion that

- (a) occurred at large stations ;
- (b) mostly in sheds and yards and to a lesser extent from running trains.

Mr. Ezekiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, was of opinion that

- (a) occurred mostly in waiting halls and also in compartments ; and
- (b) in transshipment yards as well as in the trains.

Inspector S. C. Banarji of the Saidpur Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway stated that leaving the railway staff out of consideration the bulk of the crime was committed by foreign criminals generally from other provinces. Offences as regards (a) mostly occurred at railway stations (waiting halls and platforms), and as regards (b) mostly in transshipment yards.

Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, thought that railway crime was largely the work of local thieves and also of railway employees themselves, especially menials.

Inspector Hashmutullah agreed. He mentioned that crime regarding (a) passengers and their luggage mostly occurred in running trains and waiting rooms at stations.

(b) Goods were generally robbed from goods sheds and station yards and railway employees were generally suspected.

Inspector Upendra Chandra Deb thought that (a) were committed by professional thieves and pick-pockets at big stations, and (b) by local thieves with the connivance of railway menials.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezekiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, was of opinion that railway crime was mostly the work of local thieves. Offences as regards (a) mostly occurred in passenger sheds and as regards (b) mostly from wagons stabled in the yard.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Kharagpur, stated that offences as regards (a) unbooked luggage from the compartments were mostly committed by fellow passengers. It was a

case of opportunity making the thief. The owners were extremely careless, even large sums of cash being conveyed without any care. In a recent case on the Ben al-Nagpur Railway a third class passenger carried half a lakh of rupees in notes and cash and left it lying on the seat. He went to sleep and awoke to find that one of the bags containing Rs. 1,000 had been stolen by a fellow passenger. Thefts from booked luggage were almost invariably the work of railway servants. Thefts of luggage from waiting halls were not infrequently the work of fellow passengers and of the station menial staff.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that in goods thefts local thieves were mostly concerned, but in the case of thefts from passengers foreign criminals also took part.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that railway crime in respect of missing goods cases was seldom the work of any but local thieves and mostly of the railway staff themselves. Thefts as regards (a) mostly occurred in running trains for which local as well as inter-provincial thieves were responsible. Thefts from waiting halls were also committed by local and foreign pick-pockets. Offences as regards (b) mostly occurred in goods sheds and transshipment sheds and seldom from running trains. In small stations where there were no sheds or in respect to goods booked as parcels, thefts took place from parcel offices or brake-vans and the railway staff themselves were mostly, if not entirely, responsible.

Inspector Fouzdar Narain Kuar stated that offences as regards (a) occurred in waiting halls and as regards (b) in goods trains and from wagons in yards.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that railway crime was mostly the work of local thieves. Thefts of goods were almost entirely committed by the menial staff. Professionals were generally responsible for running train thefts but these had been fewer since criminal tribe settlements had been started in Bombay. Thefts under (a) occurred chiefly in waiting halls, booking halls and platforms and under (b) in yards.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, agreed and stated that the majority of thefts under (a) occurred in waiting halls, and under (b) in goods yards.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that railway crime was mostly committed by railway servants. Offences as regards (a) occurred in waiting halls, on platforms and in 3rd class compartments, and as regards (b) in goods sheds and wagons in yards.

Inspector Glackan stated that railway crime was mostly the work of local railway menials—(a) were generally committed at large stations like Khandwa and Itarsi by outsiders; (b) were generally committed in goods sheds.

Inspector Sharif Mohammad Khan stated that railway crime was mostly the work of local menial railway staff, (a) was committed by foreigners, and (b) by railway menial staff.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi stated that railway crime was mostly the work of local thieves especially crime in the goods sheds, but crime on platforms and running trains was generally committed by outsiders. As regards (a) the offences were committed on the platforms and in passenger halls at big stations and as regards (b) the crime was committed at big stations.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula stated that railway crime was mostly the work of local menial staff of the railway, and offences as regards (a) occurred mostly in waiting rooms and running trains and (b) in station yards.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that railway crime was mostly the work of local thieves except in respect to passengers' property and luggage which at times was the work of inter-provincial thieves. Offences as regards (a) occurred on station platforms and in trains and as regards (b) occurred in station yards and running trains.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that thefts on passenger halls were committed by professionals or by dishonest passengers. Thefts from goods at stations were mostly committed by a combination of professionals and menial staff. Goods at sheds were stolen by menials and professionals probably in the proportion of 80 to 20. Most offences as regards (a) occurred in passenger sheds and trains and as regards (b) in goods sheds.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, was of opinion that railway crime was mostly the work of local thieves and occurred as regards (a) mostly in running trains and as regards (b) in running trains and station yards.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali was also of opinion that railway crime was mostly the work of local thieves—(a) occurred at all changing stations and (b) on those portions of the line where there were gradients.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that with the reservation that railway crime was mostly the work of railway employees local thieves were more concerned than outside criminals. In certain special forms of crime, however, such as drugging for robbery and pocket-picking, professional thieves from a distance were usually concerned. (a) Offences against passengers mostly occurred in waiting pens, booking halls, and on platforms. Offences against passengers' luggage usually occurred in the brake-van and less frequently on waiting platforms. (b) As regards goods, most offences occurred on running goods trains and in goods yards.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that railway crime was partly the work of local thieves and partly of outsiders sheltered by local offenders or railway servants. Most of the crimes occurred in goods sheds, goods yards and parcel offices. In certain special kinds of crime, *i.e.*, poisoning, pocket-picking and thefts from running goods trains professional thieves from different centres were usually concerned.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that railway crime was mostly the work of local thieves. Most of the offences occurred as regards (a) passengers, in waiting halls and on platforms, and as regards passengers' luggage on running trains. As regards (b), the offences occurred in goods trains, goods yards and on transshipment platforms.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that crime of a professional nature was not frequent in the province. It was the work of local thieves generally. "The type of railway criminal who preys upon running goods and passenger trains down country is practically non-existent." Local pick-pockets and cheats were active at times in crowded passenger halls, passages and compartments. It was the work of the Police to prevent their activities and extra men were posted at local places where such thefts were frequently reported. Local thieves got opportunities at goods sheds or in yards.

Question No. 16.—Is there any want of co-operation between the Railway and the District Police in British India or in Native States?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that co-operation was not as good as it should be in British India. In Indian States there was practically no co-operation. He had had experience of this in Rajputana. The senior officials of the Railway Police were, as a rule, in fairly close touch with the higher officials of the State, but the subordinate officials of the Railway and the Police were not, as a rule, in sympathy.

Mr. Bigbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that he did not experience any difficulty in "A" section. In the Native States of Dholpur and Gwalior, through which a portion of his charge passed, he had had no trouble as regards co-operation, and he had always received all reasonable assistance from the District Police.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent of Police, stated that the District Police were ready to co-operate whenever asked for assistance, but naturally they did not take as much interest in Railway Police cases as in their own cases.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent, stated that there were no chances of friction. The officers were themselves to blame if they were not able to work together. He had worked on the Bina Section where co-operation was necessary with the Bhopal State, and he had had no difficulty in getting the State Police there to co-operate.

Inspector Macleod mentioned that there was no want of co-operation between the two forces at Lucknow.

Inspector Murphy stated that relations at Moradabad were excellent.

Mr. Thomas, District Superintendent of Police, Cawnpore, stated that while in the Rajputana Railway Police he invariably asked for the assistance of the State Police as many of the cases of running train thefts, burglaries and dacoities appeared to be the work of persons living in Native States. On the whole the assistance given was satisfactory. Some States were excellent. The matter entirely depended upon the officer concerned. As a District Superintendent of Police no complaints had yet reached him about want of co-operation between the Railway and the District Police, but ordinarily the local Sub-Inspector did not give any real assistance. He promised much but did nothing. When in the Railway Police he did not get much assistance from adjoining provinces. For instance, Bombay, where the system appeared to be entirely different, would not take up running train theft cases; they required actual proof of theft before they undertook investigation. They required the Railway to make a departmental enquiry first before a case was handed over to the Police. With reference to the Punjab he always had a certain amount of trouble over jurisdiction at Rewari.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent of Railway Police, Agra, stated that genuine co-operation was not always forthcoming from the District Police or Native States, which was due either

to apathy or failure to realize their responsibilities in the matter of railway thefts and sometimes to their joining hands with the culprits. There was much room for improvement in this matter. At present the District Police only registered cases when the Railway Police localized them and even then disputed the point of localization. They registered these cases without number, the result being that when the Deputy Inspector-General called for a statement of cases localized from the District Police at the end of the year, these were not shown. An instance occurred in Jhansi district where 40 cases were localized but were not shown in the statement when called for. He was of opinion that running goods train thefts should be investigated by both the Railway Police and the District Police.

Inspector Farrant stated that co-operation was practically non-existent. Matters could be improved by the strict enforcement of the rule that obtained in the province that if the Railway Police located a running goods train theft and reported it to the District Police, the latter should register it immediately. This was a point which inspecting officers of the District Police did not always remember, i.e., to see how many cases had been registered and whether they had been reported to the District Police. In fact he thought that District Superintendents did not know that such a rule existed. The District Sub-Inspector of Police did not like to register. He received so many cases that if he registered them, it would look as if he was unaware of the state of affairs in his jurisdiction or that he was conniving at them.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi agreed with Mr. Sharpe in his opening remarks and added that co-operation was of two kinds, one on paper and the other genuine co-operation. If District Police officers took part in Railway Police investigations and assisted the Railway Police that could be called genuine co-operation, but the Railway Police did not get that kind. Most of the District Police constables and also head constables were connected with bad characters. At Moghalsarai there had been thousands of cases in which the District Police constables were concerned.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated that co-operation at present was merely nominal. There were two important features in the crime dealt with by the Railway Police, which were the main facts at issue in the whole situation, (1) thefts from passengers whether from the passenger hall, platform or running train, and (2) thefts from running goods trains. If these two crimes could be prevented, the service rendered would be appreciable. In both of these items ready help and co-operation from the District Police was most essential and without it nothing could be done. Sometimes a helping hand was stretched out in earnest but sometimes there was only a good deal of talk.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shanker stated that co-operation depended largely on the efforts or ability of the officers concerned.

See replies to questions 30 and 31.

Bombay.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, stated that real co-operation only existed when the Railway Superintendent made a special appeal to the District Superintendent of Police and continued only as long as the District Superintendent stimulated his subordinates. Continued co-operation would only be achieved under a system of double registration which would compel the District Sub-Inspector to take action when he saw that the figures in his crime register were rising. (See also his reply to question 30.)

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that the Railway Police and District Police did co-operate.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police, thought that there was a want of co-operation and suggested that in the case of running train thefts the offence should be registered by the Railway Police and the District Police.

Inspector Garside, on special duty with the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, as Watch and Ward Inspector at Ahmedabad, stated that there was difficulty in obtaining the co-operation of the District Police. He suggested that at a large railway station like Ahmedabad the District Police should be in charge of the portions between the distant signals, while the Railway Police should be in charge outside the distant signals.

Sub-Inspector Rege stated that there was a want of co-operation on the part of the District Police especially in connection with running train thefts.

Mr. Lallubhai Hargobindas, Public Prosecutor, Godhra (Panch Mahals), was of opinion that it was essential for co-operation that the Railway Police and the District Police should be under the same superior.

Mr. Guider, formerly Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Bombay, and now Watch and Ward Superintendent, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that there was a certain amount of co-operation which varied according to the relationship existing between the two forces. Unless the Railway Police took the initiative the District Police seldom evinced any interest in railway cases. The Railway Police failed sufficiently to cultivate the acquaintance of the District Police by endeavouring from the start to establish cordiality on principle. They waited till an occasion arose and the effort they then made failed to create the same impression or secure the cordial reciprocation which a more spontaneous advance would have achieved. In the Native States the amount of co-operation was nominal, except in those States where the Police administration was properly organized.

See replies to questions 30 and 31.

• Madras.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General, did not think there was any want of co-operation. There was, however, a complaint that the Railway Police constable was too much specialized in railway work. After he had been in the railway for some time he practically became a railway manial. "His vision is confined to the railway fencing." As a matter of fact three-fourths of his work was concerned with the District Police but being so specialized he was useless for work connected with the District Police. The rules regarding the jurisdiction of the Railway Police in the district did not render Railway Police work difficult. The assistance of the District Police could always be obtained. There ought, however, to be some classification of cases. Cases of dacoity, robbery and murder should be transferred from the jurisdiction of the Railway Police to that of the District Police. The division of work might be so arranged that anything occurring between two stations was a District Police case unless it was connected with the working of the railway. The Railway Police were not really concerned with cases of murder in trains. "The Railway Police are to my mind saddled with a number of cases which do not properly belong to them."

Mr. Hanington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, did not consider that there was any particular want of co-operation in British India but in Native States there was sometimes some trouble.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, stated that he found the local Police helped him quite reasonably. If there were reasonable co-operation between the District Police and the Railway Police he did not see any advantage in handing over theft cases as soon as localized to the District Police. The knowledge of the District Police was very useful but the handing over of running train thefts to them would not lead to despatch of work.

Inspector Doraiswami stated that he had no complaint to make regarding the co-operation between the District Police and Railway Police. The District Police were not informed of running train thefts at once. The Railway Police investigated first and then informed the District Police. He had experienced great difficulty in getting replies from other Railway Police Districts. The Railway Police had handed over many "known depredators" to the District Police. Railway Police constables were instructed to get to know them by sight. There were periodical meetings between the Inspectors of both forces.

See replies to questions 30 and 31.

Bengal.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General of Police, thought that co-operation between the Railway Police and the District Police had improved since the railways were placed in charge of Range Deputy Inspectors-General. There was little co-operation when the Railway Police were under the Crime Deputy Inspector-General. One of the reasons for separating the Railway Police from the Deputy Inspector-General of the Criminal Investigation Department certainly was that the duties of Crime, Railways and Rivers were found too much for one Deputy Inspector-General, but equally the plan was adopted with the idea of producing greater co-operation as a reference to Mr. Plowden's letter to Government when suggesting the change would show. There was no want of co-operation in Cooch Behar. It might do some good to have all running train thefts registered both by District Police and Railway Police. There was no indication that Railway Police work was suffering under the Range system.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, and Inspector D. N. Mukerjee thought that co-operation was wanting and that it would be better if an officer of the District Police was appointed as an intermediary between the District Police and the Railway Police at important stations where co-operation was essential, for instance, at Asansol and Howrah. Further, a system of double registration should be introduced for certain cases. The District Police at present did as much as they were able to do in the time at their disposal. They should, however, devote more time to watching railway thieves and receivers. Where running train thefts became frequent a Sub-Inspector from the District Police was deputed to work as an extra Sub-Inspector in the Railway Police. Joint investigation did not appear feasible.

Mr. Cook, District Magistrate, Midnapore, said that the Railway Police had certain methods of getting into touch with the local Police by sending enquiry slips as soon as cases occurred asking them to assist in making enquiries. Co-operation, however, depended entirely on the personality of the Superintendent of Police.

Mr. Ezekiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, had no complaints. When a running train theft was located the District Police were informed. Registration of running train thefts by the District Police would not have the effect of making them take more interest in railway crime. There might be more co-operation between different Railway Police Districts. "We are throwing cases at one another."

Inspector Banerjee of the Saidpur Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway stated that there was want of co-operation. The District Police had no time to spare for Railway Police work.

See replies to questions 30 and 31.

Assam.

The Assam Government stated that the want of co-operation between the Railway and District Police where the two forces belonged to different provinces was the main ground for their recommendation that the Railway Police jurisdiction should be altered. Even within the Province co-operation was not as effective as it might be.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, mentioned that occasionally the District Police failed to take sufficient interest in the prosecution and relegation to jail of the remnants of gangs of thieves who might get off for want of evidence in railway cases. Thus gangs were not thoroughly broken up. Again the Railway Police in cases of thefts from goods wagons and running trains did not always advertise details and descriptions of identifiable property stolen through the local Police at chowkidari parades and did not request the District Police to watch the bazaars, etc. In important cases of running train thefts the Railway Police sent information to the District Police but did not inform them of ordinary petty cases.

Inspector Syed Hashmatullah mentioned that the Railway Police sometimes received no proper help from the District Police in discharging their duties.

Inspector Upendra Chandra Deb said that there was no want of co-operation. There was only one Native State, namely, Hill Tipperah which also rendered assistance.

See replies to questions 30 and 81.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government stated that no want of co-operation had come to their notice.

Mr. Macrae, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, stated that practically no complaints were received.

Mr. Ezekiel, Superintendent of Railway Police, Patna, stated that co-operation on the whole was fair. He had never heard from his officers of any difficulty in working outside their own province. He had served in the District Police where the Railway Police were under the control of another province. Before the partition of the East Indian Railway in 1916 the Superintendent of Railway Police at Howrah used to run the whole length from Howrah to Moghalsera. At that time there were frequent complaints from that officer about the want of co-operation in Bihar. He himself was then in Monghyr. He had found that his Deputy Inspector-General was able to give him an adequate amount of time. With a Range Deputy Inspector-General in charge of Railway Police things would be easier for the latter force. In practically every case the property and the thief belonged to the District Police and unless the Railway Police could secure the assistance of the District Police it was practically impossible to work out a case. If the Railway Police had any vacancies they were filled from the District Police who naturally sent their worst men.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Kharagpore, stated that he had not found any difference between the amount of co-operation and assistance that he could obtain from the Bengal Police or from the Police of his own province. As regards the Native States in his section, so far as sending men was concerned, they assisted readily enough but went no further. It was the old story, the State Police being backward did not want any crime shown against their particular *thaka*. He got no intelligent co-operation at all from the District Police in British India. The sort of co-operation that he expected from the District Police, if working properly, was that they should assist in cases where there was a series of crimes within a specified area or where there was organized professional crime. If they did not do so progress was impossible. The members of the gangs who committed the offences were known to the District Police but were not known to the Railway Police, and even if they were known to the Railway Police the latter had no means of dealing with them except through the District Police. He had himself experienced that difficulty in investigating important cases. He had gone to a village and found that the residents did not look upon him as a police officer and that he had no status. "Everything has to be done through the local Police Inspector or Sub-Inspector. Until their co-operation is secured the Railway Police might just as well stay away from the village." When the Railway Police for instance went to a village to enquire into cases of friction between the permanent-way gang and the villagers they could do absolutely nothing without the help of the local Police. Cases of that nature should therefore be taken up by the District Police and not by the Railway Police. During the last year the Railway Police had been deputing constables from their stations to jails and to district police stations in order to become acquainted with the bad characters. Inspectors in charge of district police stations were supposed to point out the local bad characters who committed crime on the railways or used the railway for committing crime elsewhere. The scheme was being carried out under the orders of the Inspector-General of Police. Constables had often returned to their *thanas* after only being in the District Police stations for two or three days with the information that the local Sub-Inspector had no local bad characters, or the Court Sub-Inspector who was supposed to give the constable a list of the men returned the constable to the *thana* without the list. When reference was made to the Court Sub-Inspector he would reply that he had no time on the

particular morning and was busy with the prosecution of cases. He took absolutely no interest in the matter.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent of Police, did not consider that there was any want of co-operation between the two forces. Co-operation depended on the personality of officers. If he went and met an officer he was quite certain that that officer would render him every assistance. No Railway Police officer could work out his cases without the assistance of the District Police. All the stolen property went to the District Police jurisdiction. He had worked for 30 years but had never yet found a Sub-Inspector refusing assistance. If he had to search a house he applied to the Sub-Inspector who sent his constables. If he himself wanted the Sub-Inspector's presence he would also come. The villagers paid less respect to the Railway Police than they did to the District Police and they did not give information in the same way as they would to the District Police.

Inspector Indar Sen Sachar was also of opinion that it was a question of personality and he had little to complain of personally. He had been a District Police Inspector and had had first hand experience. He suggested the following remedies :—(a) The Railway Police Superintendent should be given the power to make remarks in the service books of District Police officers in the same way as the District Police Superintendent made annual remarks in the service books of Railway Police officers. That arrangement should particularly apply to the case of Prosecuting Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors with whom Railway Police Superintendents had constantly to deal. (b) Superintendents of the Railway and District Police should fix meetings of their subordinates more often and insist on their attendance. (c) Railway Police officers should be encouraged to attend chowkidari parades and thus gain the confidence of the rural Police. The District Police at present took little interest, and even between adjoining Police stations there was not so much co-operation as there ought to be. The District Police generally failed to co-operate with the Railway Police in the class of men they sent to assist the Railway Police in their enquiries; instead of sending an Inspector or Sub-Inspector when asked for they sent a chowkidar who was of no assistance.

Inspector Fauzdar Narain Kuar stated that there was no want of co operation.

See replies to questions 30 and 31.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that in the Central Provinces there was not any want of co-operation between the Railway and the District Police, but where the line ran through Native States very little help was obtained from the District Police. There was a great deal of *esprit de corps* in the Central Provinces and co-operation was always insisted upon.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, stated that co-operation between the Railway Police and the District Police in serious crime was not bad. The greatest difficulty experienced by the Railway Police was the location of the scene of crime. If this could be more easily ascertained there would be a greater amount of co-operation between the two forces. There was little or no co-operation with the Native States Police. The District Police could give more assistance if supplied with better and fuller information by the Railway Police. Generally the only information that could be given was, for instance, that a bale of piece-goods was found missing at a certain place but no details could be given. Information as to the nature of the piece-goods could not be given until details were obtained from the consignor. Before that could be obtained about 10 to 15 days had elapsed.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that there was want of co-operation between the two forces. In the case of railway crime the criminals usually came from the District Police jurisdiction and the property was very likely disposed of there. The District Police did not take sufficient interest in looking after the stolen property or even after the thief. It was really the Railway Police that had to take interest, but they had not the time to work in the District Police jurisdiction. They went to the District Police with a view to enlisting their sympathy; while the Railway policeman was there the District Police showed some interest, but the moment he left the District Police forgot the whole case. In large centres like Jubbulpore and Nagpur the District Police should send a Sub-Inspector to take notes at the Railway Police station.

Inspector Glacken stated that the Native States Police rendered such assistance as was desired, but did not interest themselves in Railway cases.

Inspector Sharif Mohammad Khan stated that there was no lack of co-operation between the Railway and the District Police. There was no real co-operation with Native States and in regard to the District Police there was not that degree of interest which fostered real co-operation.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi stated that the District Police both in British India and in Native States co-operated with the Railway Police.

Sub-Inspector Baij Nath Kaula stated that there was intense co-operation between the Railway and the District Police.

See replies to questions 30 and 31.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, did not consider that there was any want of co-operation. The District Police had nothing to do with the Railway and that was why they did not take much interest in Railway cases.

See reply to questions 30 and 31.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that except in the Ajmer-Merwara District the Rajputana Railway Police jurisdiction ran entirely through Native States where, as a general rule, an organized police force as was understood in British India did not exist. The States were willing ostensibly to assist, but as a general rule, they had neither the means nor the power to do so.

See reply to questions 30 and 31.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that he found that the District Police were ready to assist in the prevention and detection of railway crime but "they regard the Railway much as they would a person who, having valuable property in his possession, will not take obvious means to protect it and are therefore not too keen about the matter." Railway crime was considerable and the District Police were worried by it. They wanted this crime reduced by all wagons being locked. If they were called upon to assist in one or two cases in a month they would do so but when asked to assist continuously they only became tired. District Superintendents of Police did not show railway crime in their returns, but it would be a good thing if they did so. These figures should also be shewn in the District Thana Returns, but if that were done the District Police should be given more responsibility over crime. This responsibility might be ensured by providing for joint investigations. The District Police would have to be called in every time there was a crime on the Railway, to assist in the investigation or to take over the investigation themselves. Once the theft was proved to have been committed in their jurisdiction or once the property was proved to have been taken into the District Police limits the whole investigation should devolve on the District Police. Rewarding the District Police for Railway work had been very effective but Railway Police Superintendents should have larger grants for the purpose. If a District Police officer was capable and wanted to be regarded as such he did not want a number of undetected crimes on his register. It was hopeless for the Railway Police to undertake bad livelihood cases. These cases should be run by the District Police. The majority of railway bad characters were people who more or less specialized in railway crime, i.e., the District Police knew nothing about them unless their attention was drawn to them. The Railway Police recorded reasons of suspicion against any man whom they suspected of having committed a theft on the railway and sent the information on to the District Police and asked them to assist.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali was of opinion that there was a lack of co-operation between the Railway and District Police. So long as the Railway Police officer and the District Police officer knew one another assistance was obtained but when they were not acquainted the Railway Police received no assistance whatever. No regular reports were made of running train thefts to the District Police. When any theft took place and goods were carried off from the line no proper arrangements were made for following up the track. The procedure that ought to be followed in such cases was that information should be given at once to the District Sub-Inspector or Inspector and they should be asked to proceed to the spot immediately. If they failed to do so the Deputy Superintendent of Police should be wired to send them. It was a custom to employ trackers in Sind but it generally rested with the District Police to secure them and they often did not display as much energy as they might. He had been outside his own province to make investigations. On one occasion he went to Bannu in the North-West Frontier Province. He did not get the same assistance as he would have got in his own province. He merely had to make a few enquiries from the Railway Police there. He was attached to the Railway Police when Sind formed part of the Punjab. In those days there were complaints that the Railway Police did not get proper assistance from the District Police and this was due to the fact that the Punjab people considered the Sind people as outsiders. There were also complaints that all the Railway Police were Punjabis and did not understand the local language in Sind or the ways of the people.

See replies to questions 30 and 31.

Punjab.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General of Police, considered that co-operation was to a great extent a personal matter. Some District Superintendents of Police paid attention to the Railway Police, while others ignored them, but the matter was one which could be

arranged by administrative officers who should insist on better co-operation. With reference to the suggestion that Railway cases should be included in Thana returns in order to give Stationhouse officers a sense of responsibility, it would not be legal under section 154 of the Criminal Procedure Code to do so. Such an arrangement would also have the effect of producing two forces pulling different ways. Both the District Police and the Railway Police would investigate the same case, and under the present law each officer would have to submit his case-diary to his superior officer which was inadvisable. Regarding the suggestion that murders should be investigated by the District Police investigating officers should be guided by Rule 25-7(1) of the Police Rules which gave full discretion to District Superintendents of Police to decide as to the jurisdiction in which the investigation should be made. The District Superintendent of Police had power to order whether a case should be taken up by the Railway Police or by the local Stationhouse officer. He did not agree with the suggestion that the Railway Police who at present took up cases of that nature, in future should not do so, as a certain amount of preliminary investigation had to be made before it could be decided whether the case was purely a Railway Police or District Police affair. Things should be left as they were. If co-operation did not come naturally it could be enforced by the higher administrative officers.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that co-operation between superior officers in British India and in Native States was very fair but there was very little, if any, between the lower ranks. Both forces had means of exchanging information through the Gazette. Every Police station received a copy of the Gazette in the vernacular. Co-operation with District Police was the one thing essential in working out running goods train thefts. The receivers always lived outside railway limits and generally the thieves too. The assistance of the District Police as regards pick-pockets was not so important, as they were generally professionals and not local men.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that co-operation was merely nominal, each officer caring more for his own work. Besides, District Police officers complained of insufficient strength to cope even with their own work. In one district police station there would probably be 7 to 12 men who had 200 villages under their charge. Crime had increased on account of famine. The Sub-Inspector would be busy with his own murder cases for which he was held responsible. If the railway policeman said that he had a similar case the District Police officer would not worry. The Railway Police had no jurisdiction beyond the railway fencing. If reports from station masters were received about cases the Railway Police Sub-Inspector proceeded to the spot only to find that there was no one to tell him what had occurred and that the passenger had already left by the train. No full statement could be obtained, yet that was necessary in order to secure hints for investigation. He cited the instance of a case at Eminabad where it was learnt that an accused by name Bhagat Singh with 2 Muhammadans and 34 Sikhs had taken shelter. A full statement was obtained as to the number of men concerned in the case. He himself sent personally for the District Police and wired to the District Superintendent of Police and the Circle Inspector. None of them however assisted in the investigation being probably busy with their own murder cases. If certain Railway Police cases were registered in District Thanas then the District Police Officer would have some responsibility.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that there was much want of co-operation between the Railway and the District Police. The District Police took no interest in Railway Police cases and tried to evade investigations as much as possible. He suggested that running goods trains cases should be registered in the District Thana and District Police Officers should be held responsible for them as if they were their own cases. Co-operation between the State Police and the Railway Police was less than that existing between the Railway Police and the British District Police.

See replies to questions 30 and 31.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that there was no want of co-operation and the District Police rendered assistance whenever required. He was the first officer to take charge of the Railway Police in the North-West Frontier Province when it was separated from the Punjab. From his experience better co-operation was obtained when the whole police force was under one Inspector-General. Even at present the District Police never willingly helped the Railway Police unless compelled to do so. When in the District Police he looked upon the Railway Police as "a corps of chaprassis" and not as people whom it was incumbent upon him to help. Even if the Railway Police force were imperialized, practically the same difficulty which at present existed would remain. Imperialization would improve matters so far as Railway work was concerned, but not so far as co-operation between the Railway Police and the District Police force was concerned. This co-operation was, however, important where local thieves were concerned. After a theft was committed the property was always taken away into the District jurisdiction and searches had to be made far away from the Railway jurisdiction. With an imperial force probably even greater difficulties would be experienced than were being felt at present.

See reply to questions 30 and 31.

Question No. 17.—Can you instance any cases of malpractices on the part of railway and police subordinates which have come under your own immediate observations, and can you suggest any measures for checking such malpractices?

United Provinces.

Mr. Acock, District Superintendent of Police, mentioned that the railway police made money like most other subordinates in India, but they had to be very careful as they knew that they had the whole railway staff against them. Station masters made money by selling wagons and on the handling of merchandise where the contract was in their hands. In many cases while the railway were paying the station masters for handling the goods, merchants employed coolies at their own expense. If the merchants objected, they found it difficult to get wagons for the despatch of their goods, or when goods wagons came for them they would be left in the yard instead of being put on the goods shed line. The transshipment shed station masters and goods clerks underpaid their staff, leaving them to help themselves from the merchandise in their charge.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, mentioned an instance which occurred recently at Muttra where the booking clerk charged one anna extra on each ticket. The matter was reported to the Traffic Inspector who put a stop to it. There were some cases in which the goods or parcel clerks received a package or consignment 5 or 10 seers short at their stations from guards, and made a note of the shortage in the registers to protect themselves. When the consignee came to take delivery, they made him sign a clear receipt before showing him the package. If the consignee objected to removing the package on seeing its contents, he was told that he had signed a clear receipt and the railway were no longer responsible for the package and that it must remain there at his own risk. In other words, they deliberately made the consignee sign a clear receipt when they knew that the package was not intact.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that cases of malpractices were prevalent at *mela* times when constables and the railway staff combined to extract money from pilgrims. Passengers detected travelling without tickets were also liable to be treated in the same manner. Dishonest booking clerks were very apt to extract money. The only remedy lay in better supervision by the police and railway officials.

Inspector Farrant mentioned that tickets were sold at Ait Railway Station to passengers at enhanced rates during the *mela* traffic in 1920 by the booking clerk through the constable on duty. Such malpractices would be reduced considerably if the superior railway officials paid frequent surprise visits to stations and checked tickets and cash at the booking offices. Exemplary punishment should be awarded to offenders and there should be strict enforcement of the rule that tickets must not be sold to the railway police on duty.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi agreed with Inspector Farrant in his observations.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz mentioned the practice of giving delivery of consignments under clear receipt, which malpractice could be circumvented if consignees when asking for delivery were informed by the Railway as to the condition of the consignment so as to receive a qualified remark on the book.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shanker stated that a large number of cases could be cited where theft was committed by the railway staff, the worst offenders being the shunting staff. Improvement was observed when strict enquiries were made at their residence prior to enlistment.

Bombay.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that he had found that the closer the supervision the better the behaviour of the police became. The police should be forbidden to take any part in the railway administration.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that in his district railway servants had been prosecuted for theft and policemen had been punished for harassing passengers. The remedy lay in efficient supervision.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that as far as his jurisdiction was concerned only one policeman had been run in for theft and convicted in 1920. On the other hand, many railway employees had been run in and convicted during the year. In the Victoria Terminus yard alone over 40 cases of employees having been convicted had occurred in 1920. Recently a station master had also been convicted.

Sub-Inspector Rege mentioned no instances but suggested that the best method of checking malpractices lay in surprise visits by superior officers. During 1920, 39 railway men were sentenced in his police station for thefts. They included coolies, carriage examining staff and tranship clerks. At Kalyan *hamals* had been caught extracting dhoties from consignments with the connivance of tranship clerks.

Ahmedabad.

Mr. Dahyabai Ijatram, Pleader, Ahmedabad, mentioned that during 1920 goods worth 2 lakhs (cast iron) were systematically sent from Baroda to Ahmedabad and were there melted.

The fraud eventually detected and a *bania* from Barola, a ticket collector, loader and an employee of the Engineering Department in-charge of the material were convicted and sentenced to two years by the High Court.

Mr. Lallubhai Hargovindas, Public Prosecutor, Godhna, mentioned that the railways did not give wagons in order of demand in spite of the fact that a Priority Register was maintained. Preference was given to those persons who were able to secure the favour of the station masters by payments. He suggested that the Priority Register should be kept public and open to the inspection of all. At present station masters did not pay any attention to the orders of the District Traffic Superintendent about wagons.

Madras.

Mr. Wandle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, gave instances :

By Railway Staff—(1) selling of tickets at a premium ; (2) extraction from wagons.
By Police—(1) theft from consignments by subordinates ; (2) accommodating passengers by buying tickets, (3) extortion from travellers.

The chief reason why abuses still flourished was the natural antipathy of travellers to make complaints which would probably put them to great inconvenience, expense and anxiety.

Bengal.

Inspector D. N. Mukerjee mentioned that booking clerks, luggage clerks, ticket-checkers and goods clerks took illegal gratifications for services done. Booking clerks sometimes cheated ignorant passengers by giving short journey tickets or taking more than the actual fare. Luggage clerks, ticket-checkers and goods clerks cheated the railway company by undercharging or failing to realize excess fare. Police constables and head constables accepted illegal gratifications from carters or hackney carriage drivers and coolies. They also got a share from luggage and booking clerks and ticket checkers. The best way to check these malpractices was to employ a set of officers of unimpeachable honesty and integrity to bring to them to light.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, mentioned that two railway clerks were convicted for selling wagons, (*i.e.*, the use of them) to Indian firms on forged *challans* as follows :—During the war firms like Ralli Brothers issued a certificate that they desired to send so many wagons on which they would get wagons allotted to them by the Goods Superintendent. The clerks extracted these certificates from old records, rubbed out the dates, entered fresh dates and then sold the wagons.

Inspector S. C. Banerjee said that oppression was practised by constables on passengers on petty charges such as having carried a small quantity of a combustible article like jute, a weapon like an axe, unbooked luggage or articles of a suspicious nature. These cases were or were not brought to the notice of police officers by the sufferers who preferred to settle the matter on payment of a small amount. Passengers had occasionally to pay a small amount to constables for finding accommodation in compartments and for buying tickets for them when the ticket counter was overcrowded. Constant supervision was the only remedy.

Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, mentioned that the Railway Police were generally accused of—(1) unnecessary arrest, (2) interfering with female passengers ; (3) travelling without tickets or in a higher class than was authorised by their passes ; (1) interference with the work of Railway Departments. Railway servants were generally accused of—(1) interference and obstruction in police work ; (2) the taking of illegal gratification by guards, ticket collectors, etc ; (3) cheating by booking clerks, luggage checkers, travelling ticket-checkers, etc.

Inspector U. C. Deb mentioned practices such as taking of fowls, fish, etc., from *beparis*. Guards also often took passengers without tickets.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezekiel, Superintendent of Railway Police, Patna, cited the instance of a head constable, who was discovered by a police patrol in a station yard examining the labels of wagons with the obvious intention of committing theft. He was dismissed departmentally. He was working in conjunction with Railway yard chowkidars who had been reported to the District Traffic Superintendent for punishment.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent of Railway Police, Kharagpur, stated that there was collusion between the railway police and railway employees in the issue of tickets, in the seating of passengers and in the recovery of excess fares. It was very difficult to suggest remedies as many persons were implicated besides the lower subordinates, who actually indulged in the malpractices.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, cited an instance which came to his notice while officer in charge of a large station, of seeing a member of the railway staff in the

presence of the constable on duty taking money from passengers for allowing them into carriages. When he reached the spot the money was thrown into the crowd and the passengers totally denied having given him any money. On another occasion at Gaya, on receipt of information at night that burglars were inside the goods shed he hastened there and noticed a railway chowkidar hammering a lock sitting by the side of the shed. Arrests were made and during the course of investigation it transpired that the goods shed key which was supposed to be in the custody of the station master had been used by the chowkidar to let in the thieves and the station master also had to be sent up for trial. On a third occasion at Bankipore a transshipment clerk during the day allowed the shunting staff to extract sugar out of a consignment in the goods shed. When the chowkidar noticed that he was being watched he arrested the porter who was sent up with the clerk for trial. The ticket staff and goods staff systematically accepted illegal gratifications from passengers and merchants. The duty of taking preventive measures clearly devolved upon the Railway Authorities.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that (a) the commonest malpractice which he had noticed was the carriage of passengers free on trains and the misappropriation of their fares by guards, brakemen and the station staff. The practice was in vogue to such an extent on the Bengal and North-Western Railway that in some of the out-of-the-way sections guards earned about Rs. 10 on every trip. The rules were so defective that as soon as a passenger was found without a ticket the guard was ready with his certificate that the passenger travelled from the last station and for want of time could not purchase his ticket and before the passenger could implicate the guard of having received the fare from him the guard had stated that he or his brakeman had realized the fare with a view to purchasing the ticket for the passenger fearing that he would otherwise run away. The best method to check this malpractice was to employ travelling ticket-checkers who should be under the Audit Department of the Railway. (b) Regarding *mamuli* realized by station masters and goods clerks for booking goods or for supplying wagons, he suggested as remedies a few judicious prosecutions as also departmental punishments in the case of strong and reasonable suspicions and the constant transfers of station masters and goods clerks. A wider publicity should be given to the schedule of freights and to rules of the railways for bidding malpractices. (c) As a general practice each booking clerk charged from Re. 0-1-0 to 0-4-0 on each blank ticket he issued to ignorant passengers. This fee was openly taken as a gift for writing out the ticket and hunting up books to find out the correct fare. The best way to deal with this evil was by giving greater publicity to the fares or by employing Passenger Superintendents who would really be helpful to 3rd class passengers. There was no department of the railway which was free from malpractices. He was not surprised at this state of affairs considering that the Railway Administration was a vast organization consisting mostly of low-paid staff with large powers. It was well-nigh impossible to stamp out malpractices as long as the public was willing to pay, but better supervision would probably ensure a decrease. (d) As regards malpractices among the railway police subordinates, the only matter which came to his notice was the tips which constables expected from passengers for rendering them some assistance while travelling, e.g., purchasing their tickets or getting them seats in an overcrowded train. The Police also shared with the ticket clerks and others in what they could make from passengers by way of excess fare or freight. The recent revision of the pay of the subordinate ranks of the Police would probably lessen malpractices.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, mentioned that as regards malpractices by the Police there were occasional instances of constables making something over buying tickets. As regards malpractices on the part of railway subordinates 95% of cases of shortages were committed by those people and it was due to their not being paid sufficiently and through lack of supervision. As regards pay, they should receive a fair living wage plus a certain percentage on handling. Then if there was any loss it could be deducted from their pay. Such a system would pay the railway.

Messrs. Hurst, Mayberry, Glackan, Sharif Mohamad Khan, Mazhar Naqi and Baijnath Kaula did not quote any instances.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that if by malpractices was meant the levying of blackmail on merchants such cases had apparently not been sufficiently serious to necessitate complaints—they did undoubtedly occur but the merchants acquiesced. He gave a tabular statement of cases against (a) railway employees, (b) police, (c) outsiders.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that cases did occur, but he was unable to mention specific instances.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, was unable to mention any cases of malpractice. In addition to what he had mentioned under question 10 one instance came to his notice in which a consignment of stores valued at Rs 25,000 arrived at Quetta from Karachi. The yard foreman there re-booked the wagon to a relation of his, who was relieving station master at Hyderabad for sale. He had had an instance of a constable committing theft from a passenger for which he got 12 months' rigorous imprisonment. On one occasion a constable committed theft on a goods train for which he received 12 months' rigorous imprisonment. On another occasion a Sub-Inspector was dismissed for receiving an accused with the property from the Station Superintendent, Karachi City, and releasing him without entering a complaint. The best method of checking such malpractices was for superior officers to deal severely with their subordinates in every proved case and not to consider that it was their business to hush up matters for the good name of their respective departments.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali mentioned that in 1916-17 members of the Railway Police, a gate-keeper and a carpenter of the Traffic Department, stole some piecegoods and were prosecuted by him and duly sentenced. Special officers should be deputed to keep strict watch over the staff so that they could not get opportunities to commit malpractices.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, instanced a case in which a goods official was awaiting trial for the misappropriation of a motor-car, and cases in which guards had been arrested on charges of stealing passengers' luggage; and drivers, chowkidars, pointsmen, etc., had been arrested for committing thefts in goods yards. Railway clerks had also been arrested on charges of misappropriating consignments of fruit, nuts, etc. In one case a railway patrol constable stole a parcel. All these cases had passed through his hands during his short term of office of six months. There were other cases in which he had reason to suspect railway employees of complicity in crime. The preventive measures indicated appeared to be increased supervision on the part of the Railway Police, the better custody of goods and articles both in transit and while awaiting loading and detective arrangements on the part of the Railway Police. The provision of a Railway Police Secret Service Fund for the purpose of buying information also would not only facilitate detection but would act as a useful deterrent, inspiring a wholesome feeling of mutual distrust among dishonest employees associated in crime.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that in his division railway servants, guards, chowkidars and police constable had been convicted. Strict supervision was the only remedy for abuses.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir mentioned that he had investigated several cases of corruption against members of the railway staff, a notable instance being a case against a District Traffic Superintendent who was convicted. Cases of theft and misappropriation against members of the staff were common. Several such cases were pending at the moment.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that a certain amount of money was made by (a) over-charging fares, (b) charging but not crediting fines and fares for travelling without tickets. The remedy lay in better supervision by Traffic Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors and Inspectors of Police, and more efficient supervision by responsible officers. The appointment of passenger superintendents imposed a considerable check on malpractices for some time, but such officers might do infinitely more than they did at present.

Question No. 18.—Under what rules and by whose orders are members of the Railway Police force at present recruited, transferred, promoted, etc., and do you consider that the system requires alteration? Is the quality of the officers and men satisfactory?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that they were recruited from the District Police. There was practically no direct recruitment for the Railway Police in the United Provinces so far as officers below the rank of Sub-Inspectors were concerned. He was opposed to separate recruitment for the Railway Police partly on the ground of expense and partly because the Railway Police would become more and more out of touch with the District Police. The general control of the investigating staff and supervision of the subordinate Police devolved on the Inspectors to a far greater extent than in the case of the District Police. Case Diaries seldom in ordinary circumstances came before the Superintendent of Railway Police till the case had been disposed of and even then he sometimes did not see them, though he had recently issued orders to ensure that this was done in future. The Railway authorities had always pressed that Divisional Inspectors should be Europeans. These

Inspectors had no training in investigating work, and had, as a rule, insufficient education to enable them properly to control investigations. The Superintendent of Police, who had a great deal of office work to do and a charge comprising over 1,600 miles of railway line, was unable to give much attention to individual cases, especially as he hardly ever saw the Case Diaries while the investigation was in progress, and the result was far from satisfactory. Assistant Superintendents or Deputy Superintendents should be placed in charge of subdivisions away from the headquarters of the Superintendent. There were five Inspectors' divisions on the Oudh and Rohilkhand and to replace these Divisional Inspectors, three Assistant Superintendents would at most be required who should be men of from 4 to 6 years' service. Such officers would be young men with all their future before them and would be far more energetic and zealous than Divisional Inspectors (European or Indian) had shewn themselves to be. They could be relied on to keep a far closer and more effective watch on Sub-Inspector than those officers did, and would, in due course, acquire a great deal of Railway Police experience, which would be invaluable later on when arrangements had to be made to replace a Superintendent of Railway Police. At the same time their training in District Police work and liability to return to District Police work at any time would lead to improved co-operation with the District Police and prevent stagnation. The headquarters of such an Assistant Superintendent of Police would nearly always be also the headquarters of superior officers of the Railway administration concerned who would be of the same status as himself and would keep in close touch with him. In any case called for personal investigation, the Assistant Superintendent of Police would receive every assistance from the railway authorities. If this system was introduced, it would do much to remove many of the complaints which at present existed of the inefficiency of the Railway Police which were chiefly the result of lax supervision over the investigating staff and the lower grades of subordinates. Sub-Inspectors, head constables, and constables, were quite satisfactory, except that they needed closer supervision.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that a better class of man was wanted. Officers should all know English and constables should be literate. District Police work could be carried on with illiterate constables but not Railway Police work where the duties demanded literacy, *e. g.*, seal-checking. The best men would not come without inducements.

Mr. Acock, District Superintendent of Police, stated that a better class of man was required. Every man should be literate, able to read and write the vernacular and figures in English. Sub-Inspectors should also know English. Government had for many years been recruiting Divisional Inspectors from sergeants on Rs. 80 to 100. A competent European or Anglo-Indian officer could not be obtained for that sum and practically illiterate soldiers or the very worst Anglo-Indians were being obtained. He was inclined to separate the Sergeants' organization from Inspectors and put in Deputy Inspectors to start with, keeping the platform Sergeants separate. This type of man could not be paid Rs. 250 a month. On the other hand, a good Divisional Inspector who would deal with all crime first-hand was required, but such a man could not be enlisted on Rs. 100 per mensem. Some Divisional Inspectors were very good, but the present type were absolutely incapable, and were hardly able to write. Deputy Superintendents might be employed for such work. The quality of the Railway Police was not good, and generally speaking in the United Provinces was inferior to the District Police. He had recently made enquiries which had confirmed his previous experience that it was only the armed police constable who was tired of shouldering a musket that was willing to join the Government Railway Police. Such men were useless for Railway Police work. In the Sitapur District he called for volunteers for the Railway Police without letting the men know that he was only collecting statistics. The result was as follows. Out of the armed force consisting of 1 Sub-Inspector, 18 head constables, and 111 constables, only 15 constables volunteered. Out of the civil police consisting of 43 Sub-Inspectors, 34 head constables, and 350 constables, only one Sub-Inspector volunteered.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent of Railway Police, stated that a better class of man was required for the Railway Police than was at present being obtained, most of the men being originally in the Armed Police, the least intelligent branch of the District Police. It was not necessary for all constables to be literate, but the proportion should be higher than at present. Increased efficiency would mean more pay. His idea was that a man should be recruited from the District Police for the Railway Police after he had had a few years' experience of police work and law. It would be possible in that way to get the best type of the present class which would be preferable to tapping a superior class, and would be less expensive. The pay of the Railway Police should be sufficiently high to cause keen competition among the best men of the subordinate staff in the District Police. A gazetted officer should be required to serve for at least 10 years in the Railway Police if he agreed to join that branch. In fact, it would be better if an officer of 10 years' service joined it for the rest of his service.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, said that a better class of man was required for the Railway Police, about 60 to 70% of whom should be literate, and preferably should know English. The only way to secure this type was by giving special allowances.

Inspector Macleod did not consider that the present system under which the men were drafted from the District Police was satisfactory and preferred a separate force, if they could

be specially trained for Railway Police work at training schools. A better class of men, in fact, a literate class, was required.

Inspector Murphy thought that there should be a separate Railway Police service, and did not think it would increase the risk of non-co-operation with the District Police.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Aara, stated that the system called for alteration. Recruitment should remain in the District Police on the score of expense even if the Railway Police force were imperialised. The quality of both officers and men left much to be desired. Sub-Inspectors and head constables should know English and the majority of constables, say 80%, should be literate in either Urdu or Hindi. "At present the Government Railway Police only get the sweepings of the District Police." The nature of the work and the duties involved demanded that the majority of the staff should be literate and should know English. The quality of the constables drafted from the District Police was especially poor. Illiterate and slack aimed Policemen only were sent to the Railway Police. They received no training in Railway work and were altogether unable to do anything more than walk about the platform when first received on transfer. Constables should be selected from the literate civil police and not more than 5% of the men drafted into the Railway Police should be taken from the armed branch. Constables for this branch of the service should be specially selected.

Prosecuting Inspector Kharrat Nabi agreed.

Inspector Tarrant also considered that the system required altering. The quality of officers and men, especially the latter, was poor.

Sub-inspector Fearcy Shonker stated that the quality of the men was not satisfactory. They should be of a better class and better educated than the District Police.

Bombay.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, stated that recruitment for the Railway Police was separate from the District Police but the rules in force for the latter body also applied to the former. Although the quality of the men in the Railway Police was poor it was not worse than that of the District Police. A better class of men with more intelligence was required in the Railway Police as constables had to deal with all classes of the public. They required a knowledge of different vernaculars. They had a good deal to do with reading English in their investigations, label checking, etc. They were always in the public eye. They also had to deal with Europeans. In view of the fact that a superior class, of man was required the pay of the Railway Police would have to be raised.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that the Superintendent of Railway Police recruited, transferred and promoted his constables. No alteration in this respect was required. Certain educational standards were laid down by the Inspector-General and it was difficult to obtain men with the qualifications demanded. Superior men (compared with the District Police) were required for certain types of work such as watching for passenger train thieves and pick pockets.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that the class of officers obtained on the whole was satisfactory but the same could not be said of the men. Better pay and housing would attract a better class of man. The same rate of pay would do for both District and Railway Police. It was essential that the men should be able to read and write.

Sub-Inspector Rege did not consider that the system required alteration. The quality of the officers was satisfactory but the class of men obtained was poor, but constables of better class would not be obtained unless better paid.

Madras.

The constables are recruited separately from the District Police according to rules laid down in Police Orders.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General, stated that the quality of the officers,—Sub-Inspectors,—was as good as, if not better than that obtained in the District Police. The constables were men picked up in the streets of big towns. Local crime and Railway crime were very closely related. There was no special Railway crime.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, considered that the quality of officers and men was satisfactory.

Inspector Doraiswamy agreed.

Bengal.

Constables and head constables are recruited and appointed by the Superintendent of Railway Police—Assistant Sub-Inspectors by the Deputy Inspector-General, Sub-Inspectors and Inspectors by the Inspector-General. The promotion of constables, head constables and assistant sub-inspectors is in the hands of Superintendents of Railway Police, that of Sub-Inspectors rests with the Deputy Inspector-General and of Inspectors with the Inspector-General. The Superintendent of Railway Police makes all transfers in his district.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General of Police, and *Mr. Simpson, Deputy Inspector-General, Burdwan Range*, were of opinion that the present detective staff was not large enough. Mr.

Hyde thought that the best men in the force in Bengal, at any rate, physically, were the Railway Police constables.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, thought that no alteration was needed. The personnel of the Railway Police was good.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, said that the Railway Police was the dumping ground for slackers and investigation work was hopeless.

Inspector D. N. Mukerjee suggested that officers of the Railway Police should be transferred to another Railway Police system and not to the District Police as was done now. The constables and head constables were decidedly superior to the same class found in the District Police. Eighty per cent. of the constables were literate in the vernacular.

Inspector S. C. Banerjee thought that the quality of officers and men was satisfactory.

Assam.

Railway Police Constables are enlisted by the Superintendent of Police. Literate constables are promoted with the approval of the Inspector-General of Police to the post of head constable. Head constables are appointed direct by the Inspector-General of Police. Sub-Inspectors are nominated by the Superintendent of Railway Police and selected by the Inspector-General of Police. The Inspector-General promotes Sub-Inspectors to the rank of Inspectors. The Superintendent of Railway Police transfers officers of the rank of Sub-Inspector downwards within his district. The transfers of members of the force outside the district are made by the Inspector-General of Police. Fifty per cent. of the appointment of Sub-Inspectors are filled by promotion from head constables.

The Assam Government was of opinion that the quality of officers and men from Inspectors downwards was not satisfactory, but this was the result not of the system of appointment which did not require alteration, but of the unpopularity of the Railway Police in the case of constables and of the disinclination of District Superintendents of Police to part with good men in the case of higher officers. If Railway head constables knew that by efficient and honest work they had a really good chance of becoming Sub-Inspectors this would have an excellent effect on the whole Railway Police force.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent of Railway Police, stated that the quality especially in the lowest ranks of the Railway Police was generally admitted to be inferior to that of the District Police. On the other hand, the proportion of head constables and constables with literate qualifications was larger than that which obtained in the District Police. He mentioned that about half of his constables were literate.

Inspectors Hashmatulla and Upendra Chandra Deb thought that the quality of officers and men was satisfactory.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Railway Police force is recruited under Act V of 1861. Constables and head constables are recruited, transferred and promoted by the Superintendent of Railway Police, within the limits of his charge. Sub-Inspectors and Inspectors are recruited by the Inspector-General of Police, but are transferred within his charge by the Superintendent of Railway Police. Transfers between the Railway and District Police are made under the orders of the Inspector-General. The whole of the Railway Police was formerly under the Deputy Inspector-General, Crime and Railways, but recently the Bengal and North-Western Railway has been transferred from the control of that Deputy Inspector-General to the control of the Range Deputy Inspector-General. In October next it is intended that the three railway systems in the Province shall be placed under the respective Range Deputy Inspectors-General. Thereafter transfers from the Railway to the District Police will be made within the Range under the orders of the Range Deputy Inspector-General. The quality of officers and men is the same as in the District Police.

The Bihar and Orissa Government were of opinion that the quality of officers and men was on the whole good.

Mr. Macrae, Deputy Inspector-General of the Criminal Investigation Department, stated that the reason why the Railway Police were being separated from the Crime Deputy Inspector-General was that the work in the Criminal Investigation Department was too heavy. It was also recognized that the geographical position of the province was such that the separation of control was important and probably advantageous. Government also wish to have the Railway Police system in the Province under the Range Deputy Inspectors-General. There would not be enough work for a separate Deputy Inspector-General of Railways in Bihar. At present there was little connection between the three Railway Police jurisdictions in the Province, so that the question of passing information of what was happening, for instance, on the Bengal and North-Western Railway to the Bengal-Nagpur Railway, hardly arose. It only arose at certain points on the East Indian Railway, for instance, at Mokameh Ghat and Asansol. Although the Deputy Inspector-General, Crime, had relinquished the administrative control of the Railways the criminal aspect, that is to say, the crime on those Railways still remained with him and was a part of the general work of the Criminal Investigation Department. The plan of placing the Railway Police under the Range Deputy Inspector-General would undoubtedly ensure better co-operation with the District Police.

Mr. Ezechiele, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that the quality of officers and men was fair. All from head constables upwards were literate, but in his district only 5 out of 233 constables were literate.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar was not in favour of the Railway Police being placed under the Range Deputy Inspector-General as that would entail the transfer of members of the Railway Police to the District Police and *vice versa*. A certain amount of technical knowledge was essential for Railway Police work. There were certain advantages in the plan, but these were outweighed by the disadvantages. Officers should be really efficient in one branch of the police service. He would prefer the importation of officers from the Criminal Investigation Department for Railway Police duty, but had nothing to say against the quality of officers and men in the Railway Police.

Central Provinces.

Members of the Railway Police force are recruited from the District Police under orders of the Inspector-General of Police. Transfers of Sub-Inspectors, head constables and constables are made by the Superintendent, Railway Police, within his district. Transfers of Inspectors are made by the Deputy Inspector-General and those of gazetted officers are made by the Inspector-General. Promotions of Sub-Inspectors, head constables and constables are made by the Superintendent, of Inspectors by the Inspector-General and of gazetted officers by the Local Government.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General, Police, stated that no alteration was necessary. The quality of the staff was satisfactory. The Railway Police should have experience of District Police work and new constables should not be posted to the Railway until they had 5 to 6 years' service. There were more temptations in the Railway Police than in the District Police. The force could not be so well supervised. A train guard constable was "absolutely on his own." In small outpost stations only a couple of constables were posted. There was not the same supervision over them as there was in the *thana*. Formerly when each district ran its own length of line the Railway Police had first grade constables on the Railway. When the new police system was started the Railway Police did their own recruiting. It was eventually decided that it was not satisfactory and the Central Provinces had reverted to the system in vogue in the United Provinces of getting men from the District Police. Each district maintained a list of constables who were willing to serve in the Railway Police and the Deputy Inspector-General selected men from the list when required. For platform duty it was desirable that men should have some idea of discipline which it was not very easy to impart in the Railway Police.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, did not consider that the system required alteration. It would be better to recruit head constables and constables from the literate classes as illiterates in the Railway Police were of no use.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, did not consider the system satisfactory. Investigating officers confined themselves to the locality and made perfunctory enquiries.

Inspector Glackan considered the system satisfactory. The quality of officers and men was satisfactory except in the case of B Class head constables and constables whose recruitment should be discontinued, as literates were needed.

Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan stated that the system required no alteration, but B Class head constables and constables (*i.e.*, illiterates) did not give satisfaction.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula stated that the system required no alteration, and that the quality of officers and men was satisfactory except in the case of the illiterate head constables and constables.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the men were recruited by the head of the Railway Police for the lower ranks in accordance with the rules prescribed in the Police Manual. Subordinate officers were also selected by him and approved of by the First Assistant to the Resident. There were no fixed rules guiding transfers. Promotions amongst constables depended on the length of service and their good conduct. Promotions to the rank of head constable which depended on good conduct and efficiency were made by the head of the department. This system did not require alteration. The quality of the officers was satisfactory, but no doubt better men would come forward if the prospects were improved. About 25 % of the constables were literate.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the subordinate Police were recruited, transferred and promoted either by the Inspector-General, Railway Police, or the Superintendent, and the system required no alteration. The field of selection was not large, but the material was fair. The men were mostly Rajputs from Merwara.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that the Railway Police force in Sind was recruited, transferred, promoted, etc., under the Bombay District Police Act, IV of 1890, under the orders of the Superintendent, Railway Police and Deputy Inspector-General for Sind. He did not consider that any alteration was called for.

Inspector Khan Sahib Miran Ali Hyder Ali stated that the system was sound, but the quality of officers and men was not good.

Punjab.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General of Police stated that the greater portion of the force was enlisted direct for the railway. Formerly the members of the force were transferred from the District Police to the Railway Police with a bonus of Re. 1 per mensem, but the practice had fallen entirely into abeyance and direct recruitment had taken its place. The men still got the one rupee allowance, and there was an allowance of two rupees for literates. About half the force in the Railway Police was literate. The percentage was higher than in the District Police as railway policemen were appointed after passing some slight examination, and received a bonus or literary allowance on enlistment.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, referred to Rule 23 of the Punjab Police Rules. Volunteers were transferred from the District to the Railway Police, and direct recruitment was also resorted to. Promotions, transfers, etc., were made by the Assistant Inspector-General of Police up to and including the rank of Sub-Inspector. The Inspector-General dealt with Inspectors and the Local Government with gazetted officers. The existing system did not require alteration. The quality of officers and men was fairly satisfactory and was improving.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that no alteration was necessary and that the quality of officers and men was fair.

North-West Frontier Province.

Members of the Railway Police are recruited, transferred, promoted, etc., by the Inspector-General of Police and Deputy Superintendent in charge of Railway Police, North-West Frontier Province, under rules laid down in the Manual.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, stated that the rules pressed for literate men and recruitment from the District Police. The former was an impossible qualification to demand at present.

Khan Saheb Rana Tulia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that the present system did not require alteration. The quality of officers and men was satisfactory, but matters would be improved if all lower subordinates were literate, and if a fair percentage of the force knew English. At present in the District of Kohat about 12½ % of the force was literate and the proportion was probably the same in the Railway Police, as the men of that force were recruited from members of the District Police of not less than six months' service. All upper subordinates should know English.

Question No. 19.—Is service in the Railway Police popular? Is the personnel interchangeable with that of the District Police?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, considered that service in the Railway Police was popular, because there was generally speaking little crime on the railways and miscellaneous duties were much lighter than in the District Police. The men were much better off in the way of family quarters and received free passes for themselves and their families when they went on leave. The pay was the same though the allowances varied somewhat. The percentage of sickness was considerably lower in the Railway Police.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, did not think that the best men would come without special inducements as service in the Railway Police was not popular. The work was exacting and the men had frequent night duties to perform. Sub-Inspectors, unless they were men who were really ambitious, were quite content to stay on as they had a lighter job than in the District Police. Inspectors liked the job but there were few, if any, compensations. They were, however, far more independent than Reserve Inspectors. At the same time they should be better paid.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, stated that when the men got into the Railway Police they seemed to stick to it.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, did not consider that the service was popular. The constables had to do long hours of night work owing to paucity of staff. For the same reason leave was harder to obtain and it was well known that illness was more common. High caste men had trouble about their food when constantly travelling. Men had to be

posted at long distances from their home in climates to which they were unaccustomed. The Inspectors did not dislike the service, they got travelling allowance but did not keep good health because of the want of opportunity for getting regular exercise. They got their meals at odd hours in II class carriages or waiting rooms. They found it difficult to do good work in the waiting rooms which were generally full of people talking. Traffic Inspectors were now given private saloons and the same comfort should be given to Divisional Inspectors. Big rewards were not common on C Section as serious cases such as dacoity or murder rarely occurred, but small rewards were common for constables, as they had many opportunities for catching thieves in passenger halls and yards. Punishments were not more common in the Railway Police. Reserve Inspectors and Divisional Inspectors in the Police Department were worse paid than officers of corresponding status in the Railway and other Departments and in commercial firms. Many of them were resigning to take up other posts such as Traffic Inspectors and many more would do so if they had not their pensions to lose.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent, thought that service in the Railway Police was not popular. The chief objection was travelling. Very often the whole night was spent sitting up in the II class carriage without sleep. On arrival at destination one might get a bed or one might not, and then the next day work had to be started without any rest. Officers were out on the line for 15 or 20 days in this way while work was accumulating in office. Ordinarily Travelling Ticket Collectors on the East Indian Railway received Rs. 3 to Rs. 4 as night travelling allowance, and Inspectors with 20 or 25 years' service at present were only drawing Rs. 2 or Rs. 2-8. Traffic Inspectors' pay was Rs. 400 compared with Police Inspectors' Rs. 200. With regard to Sub-Inspectors they found that they had to investigate every little case and often cases that the Railway did not report till they were hopeless. The description of stolen property given was insufficient and there was no hope of offences being brought home to any one. Officers had to be very tactful with the railway staff. Constables had on an average about 1½ hours' duty a day.

Inspector Macleod mentioned that the Railway Police service was unpopular because it was a very much harder life. The men could not get their food at the proper time and there was greater wear and tear on their clothes, bedding, etc., and many other drawbacks. He stated that he was a loser by being in the Railway Police as Reserve Inspectors in certain districts drew an allowance, while the Railway Police Inspectors posted to the same station did not. Then there were hardships in travelling, particularly in the hot weather. He was now receiving Rs. 3 a day as allowance. If he went out at 4 in the afternoon and returned before 8 hours he got nothing.

Inspector Murphy mentioned that service in the Railway Police was unpopular because there was more work than in the districts and senior Inspectors in the districts got certain local allowances which Railway Inspectors did not get.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that the service was unpopular. The duties were onerous and exacting. Both officers and men had to remain long hours on duty without proper food or change of raiment. The abolition of free passes, the only privilege conceded to the Government Railway Police, was a serious drawback and the poor wages and travelling allowance granted to the force when compared with those paid to the railway staff caused discontent. The recent promotion given to the Police force in general had reacted unfairly on the Government Railway Police in particular. The work of a Railway Police Inspector required greater intelligence and was harder than that in the District Police and Reserve. The Reserve Inspector had about 3 or 4 hours' work a day. The Railway Inspector at Allahabad for instance worked practically all day and had to be on the line for 20 days in the month. He drew his one per cent. travelling allowance, whereas an Inspector of the District Police drew an allowance of Rs. 50 a month. These and other kindred causes had not helped to increase the popularity of service in the Railway Police.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi was of opinion that the service in the Railway Police was not popular. It was highly desirable in view of the special circumstances attached to service in the Railway Police, that the pay and prospects of the force should be better than those in the District Police. The subordinate staff of the Railway department were at present superior to the Police staff of the same status in the matter of pay and allowances which told upon the "authority" of the latter.

Inspector Farrant and Sub-Inspectors Abdul Aziz and Pearey Shanker merely stated that the service was unpopular.

The personnel is interchangeable with that of the District Police.

Bombay.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, thought the service was popular as men transferred to the District Police were always anxious to return. A man could be transferred to the District Police at his own request.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that the service was not popular now. The personnel was not interchangeable.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police, thought it was popular from the fact that on an average he signed 5 to 8 applications a day informing applicants that no vacancy

existed in the Railway Police. Resignations were not in his opinion more frequent from the Railway Police than from the District Police.

Inspector Bird and Sub-Inspector Rege did not think that the Railway Police service was altogether popular. The rank and file preferred districts as in the Railway Police there was scarcely any social life.

Mr. Lalubhai Hargorindas, Public Prosecutor, Godhra, was of opinion that the service was popular, but thought that more inducements should be given and that the Railway Police should be paid more than the District Police.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, retired Inspector of Police, was of opinion that inspectors should be given a chance of rising to Rs. 450 per mensem which was what Traffic Inspectors received.

Mr. Dayabhai Iyatron, Standing Counsel for the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, was of opinion that the service was popular because Railway Police work was easier than that in the District Police and there was less need of literates.

The personnel is not interchangeable with that of the District Police.

Madras.

Messrs. Hannington, Windle and Doraiswamy were of opinion that service in the Railway Police was popular, the chief reason being that the men could go to their homes in comfort and the work was not so strenuous as in the District Police.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General of Police, was of opinion that the service could not be actually described as popular but he had found that a particular class of men enlisted and remained in the force. There was no trouble about recruitment.

The personnel is not interchangeable.

Bengal.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General of Police and Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, thought that the Railway Police was popular. If a Railway Police constable were transferred to the District Police he would at once complain. *Mr. Simpson, Deputy Inspector-General*, agreed.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent of Railway Police, Sealdah, said that it was not popular among the subordinate officers for many reasons, one being that a Railway Police Sub-Inspector saw his brother officer in the District Police wielding tremendous influence in the locality while he himself had none. So far as constables were concerned they liked the Railway Police because there was no definite work to be done. Better work could be got out of the investigating staff if they were given saloons. At present they had nowhere to stay and they were not allowed to occupy waiting rooms. Consequently as soon as they arrived at a station they found out which was the best train by which to get away.

Inspector D. N. Mukerjee agreed with Messrs. Hyde and Bradley. So far as constables were concerned they got free passes to their homes. There was less worry in the Railway Police—especially in Bengal, where the District Police had to stay in very insanitary and malarious places. Recently there had been a change in the District Police so far as travelling allowance was concerned and they were now in a better position than the Railway Police. Very great inconvenience was experienced when on tour. Officers generally slept in the police station. In some places they utilized waiting rooms.

Inspector S. C. Banerjee said that it was very unpopular. No one from the District Police liked to come to the Railway Police because of night work and difficulty in obtaining meals.

The personnel is interchangeable with the District Police in special circumstances with the permission of the Inspector-General of Police.

Assam.

The witnesses were agreed that service in the Railway Police was unpopular.

The personnel is interchangeable under the orders of the Inspector-General of Police. The Assam Government was of opinion that interchanges should be made much more frequently than at present.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent of Railway Police, mentioned that some of the reasons for the unpopularity were that there was no accommodation and no travelling allowance while on tour. He received many applications for transfer. Sub-Inspectors complained against the work which was very troublesome and bad for their health. Many Railway Sub-Inspectors—in fact most of them—had some experience of District Police work. The constables and in some cases even Sub-Inspectors had little knowledge of the district through which their jurisdiction passed. More frequent changes would be advantageous. The system of deputing District Police Sub-Inspectors to the Railway Police and *vice versa* was tried for some years but the District Police Superintendents had found difficulties in the way

of carrying out the scheme which had met with little or no success and had dropped out of use.

Inspector Hashmatullah mentioned that the Railway Police got no travelling allowance, even single fare, when they travelled by train and they seldom secured accommodation at any roadside station, if they had to wait there to perform their duties. They also received no conveyance allowance though they had to go to the local police jurisdiction in the course of their duties.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government was of opinion that on the whole the service in the Railway Police was popular. The personnel was interchangeable with that of the District Police.

Mr. Macrae, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, stated that service in the Railway Police was not popular with Inspectors or Sub-Inspectors, but was popular with head constables and constables.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that service in the Railway Police was very popular. His experience had been that whenever there was a vacancy he had found 20 to 30 men applying to fill it. Free passes were probably one attraction and another was the absence of mofussil work. Although the personnel was interchangeable transfers were very seldom made.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Kharagpur, was of opinion that on the whole service in the Railway Police was popular.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, stated that service in the Railway Police was not very popular. The Railway Police did not get District allowances such as Conveyance Allowance and Horse Allowance. He suggested a Conveyance Allowance similar to that given to Criminal Investigation Department Officers.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that service in the Railway Police was not popular. Among District Police officers it was not considered to be a very important charge and the general public was of opinion that the Railway Police were Railway servants, hence they did not view the service with the same respect as they did a Government service. Railway Police officers had less chance of coming to the notice of District Magistrates and other high Government officers including higher police officers, and consequently there were rare cases of special promotion or special emoluments. Although Railway Police officers had not often to deal with riots and murders yet they had to deal with intricate cases of offences against property by professional criminals, poisoning and serious railway accidents requiring intimate knowledge of the working of the railways, but these were not considered to be great achievements and it was often forgotten that an officer who had the capacity for dealing with such crime effectively in his jurisdiction would acquit himself equally well if he had to deal with other types of crime.

Inspector Fouzdar Narain Kuar was of opinion that service in the Railway Police was popular.

The personnel is interchangeable with that of the District Police.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that service in the Railway Police was not popular. The concession of free passes now withdrawn by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway formerly made the service tolerable. The Police were not as well paid as Railway servants of the same status.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, agreed.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, also agreed and stated that the reason for the unpopularity was the excessive travelling involved.

Inspector Glackan stated that it was not popular with the Sub-Inspectors as the life was unhealthy on account of their not being able to take their food at regular hours.

Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan stated that service in the Railway Police was not popular. Railway servants got better pay and did more work in consequence. The Railway Police did not get proper rest or sleep and had to travel continuously.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naji stated that service in the Railway Police was unpopular because work was very heavy and tiresome with little chances of success. Expenses exceeded income.

Sub-Inspector Bajinath Kaula stated that it was unpopular, but did not mention reasons. The personnel is interchangeable with that of the District Police.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, thought the service was popular and that better men could be got in the Railway Police than those enlisting in the State Police. There was a joint training school for the two forces, the Superintendent of

which had stated that the Railway Police men were always the more literate and intelligent. The attraction of the service was that they got helped along by merchants and passengers when they looked after their goods. It was a more paying service taken all round.

The personnel is not interchangeable with that of the District Police.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that head constables and constables generally seemed to prefer the Railway Police, while Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors preferred the District Police. The constables of the Rajputana Railway Police force were generally Rajputs from Ajmer State, a few belonging to the United Provinces.

The personnel is interchangeable with that of the District Police.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that service in the Railway Police in Sind was distinctly unpopular. No good Sub-Inspector, head constable or constable of the District Police wished to be transferred to the Railway Police. The quality of the men who came for enlistment was not as good as the quality of those who offered for the District Police. Only 3 of his constables had more than 13 years' service. Constables, head constables and Sub-Inspectors ought to get more pay than the corresponding ranks in the District Police. Sub-Inspectors of the District Police were now treated as second class officers whereas Railway Police Sub-Inspectors only got intermediate passes. He placed the question of quarters as first in the order of responsibility for the unpopularity of the Railway Police. The next question was that of passes. Head constables and constables of the District Police drew double intermediate fare for journeys by rail while policemen of similar rank in the Railway Police were only granted 3rd class passes. Railway head constables and constables were treated as menials while in the District Police they were not. The matter had been put before the Railway Board and it was expected that a solution favourable to the Railway Police would be arrived at. In the meantime, however, the *morale* of the police force suffered. An inferior type of men was retained and enlisted. The temptations to join in the general loot going on around them was too great. The Railway Police Sub-Inspector had a more comfortable time than the District Sub-Inspector whose work was hard. The Railway officer travelled by train whereas the District officer had to ride, walk or proceed in some other fashion. The District officer however received more assistance in the detection and prevention of crime than a Sub-Inspector in the Railway Police.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali was of opinion that service in the Railway Police was popular, up to the time when he left in 1913, among men who were residents of other provinces on account of the railway pass system.

Constables start on Rs. 21 and rise up to Rs. 25 in Sind.

The personnel is interchangeable with that of the District Police.

Punjab.

Mr. Farguhar, Inspector-General of Police, stated that the post of Superintendent or Assistant Inspector-General of Railway Police had always been looked upon as a good billet. The Assistant Inspector-General had always been picked out as better than the ordinary run of Superintendents of Police. The post carried a good local allowance. A number of the men who had been Superintendents of Railway Police had risen to the rank of Deputy Inspector-General, and some to that of Inspector-General. As regards non-gazetted officers, the men of neither force appeared to like transfers. The personnel was interchangeable on orders between the Assistant Inspector-General and the Deputy Inspector-General for the lower grades and the Inspector-General's orders for the higher grades.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that there was no difficulty in securing direct recruits, from which it might be assumed that service in the Railway Police was popular. Volunteers from the District Police however were few, though it was rare to find railway policemen desiring transfer to a district.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that service in the Railway Police was popular in the lower grades, but in the grades of upper subordinates it was not popular and officers of the District Police did not volunteer for transfer to the Railway Police. The upper subordinates of the Punjab Railway Police had only a limited field of promotion.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that it was uncertain whether the service was popular in the case of ordinary constables, but with all other ranks service in the Railway Police was unpopular. No District Police officer volunteered for transfer to the Railway Police.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent, Railway Police, Kohat, stated that service in the Railway Police was popular with lower subordinates who had the privileges of free quarters and free passages for their families. The Railway Police in the Province had much less hardship than the District Police.

The personnel is interchangeable with that of the District Police.

Question No. 20.—Are there complaints of too frequent transfers of gazetted officers?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General, stated that the frequent transfers in recent years were due to a shortage of officers on account of the war.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that the transfers of gazetted officers were too frequent. Six officers had succeeded him in B Section in the space of two years.

Mr. Acck, Superintendent of Police, attributed frequent transfers to the difficulty in getting the right type of man.

Bombay.

No.

Madras.

No.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, said that transfers were avoided as far as possible.

Inspector Doraiswamy said that transfers were too frequent but were unavoidable.

Bengal.

No.

Inspector S. C. Banarjee of the Saidpur section of the Eastern Bengal Railway said that there had been three or four Superintendents in 18 months in his section.

Assam.

No.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government stated that no complaints of frequent transfers of gazetted officers had come to their notice. Transfers had been fairly frequent since the war for unavoidable reasons.

Mr. Ezechel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, and Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that they had not heard of any complaints.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Patna, and Babu Indar Sen Sackar, Inspector of Police, Samastipur, supported the above officers.

Inspector Fauzdar Narain Kuar stated that there were frequent complaints.

Central Provinces.

No.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

No.

Rajputana.

No.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that there were complaints of too frequent transfers of gazetted officers. There had been four Superintendents in the last five years and he himself was shortly leaving.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that there were complaints of too frequent transfers of gazetted officers. He himself was the fifth Assistant Inspector-General of the Railway Police since April 1918.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent of Police, and Inspector Ghulam Dastgir agreed. The latter stated that he had greatly suffered from the frequent transfers of his superior officers.

North-West Frontier Province.

No.

Khan Saheb Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, held charge from 1st January 1915 to 3rd May 1920.

Question No. 21.—Have you a system of fixed travelling allowance? If not, are you in favour of such a system for officers and men?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that there was no fixed system of travelling allowance, nor was he in favour of it in the case of the District Police, though it might save much unnecessary clerical labour if the system was introduced in the case of the Railway Police.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, saw no advantage in the system of fixed travelling allowance, except possibly with a view to reducing clerical work (which was a matter for consideration by data). If the men got it as a fixed addition to their pay there would not be the same inducement to travel. He thought that the proposal would result in less travelling and less work being done.

Inspector MacLeod thought that the system of fixed travelling allowance would lead to hardship because the energetic officers would be penalised.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent of Railway Police, Agra, was not in favour of such a system. The travelling allowance should be substantially enhanced, but should not be fixed, as this would mean that officers and men would go out as infrequently as possible. The Railway Police should receive the same travelling allowance as railway officials of the same status.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi agreed.

Inspector Farrant was in favour of a fixed system with certain provisions. At present the travelling allowance of one per cent. was totally inadequate and involved great hardship on those forced to travel.

Sub-Inspectors Abdul Aziz and Pearey Shunker thought that a system of fixed travelling allowance would be better than the present one.

Bombay.

No, except in the case of Sub-Inspectors who receive Rs. 40 per mensem.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, said that the system of fixed travelling allowance had only been recently introduced and he had not had the time to question officers generally, but he thought that they would like it as the allowance was sufficient. He, however, did not think that a system of fixed travelling allowance was in any circumstances a business proposition. "Under the old system the longer they are out the more they get and we want them always to be out."

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, was not in favour of a fixed system of travelling allowance.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, was opposed to any system of fixed travelling allowance and stated that such a system would not be favourable to the men. Sub-Inspectors however were in favour of the system.

Sub-Inspector Rege was of opinion that for constables a daily allowance was preferable to a system of fixed travelling allowance. A clerical allowance should be given to constables working as writers at police stations.

Madras.

The witnesses stated that there was a system of fixed travelling allowance (Rs. 4) for beat constables, but none of them was in favour of the system.

Bengal.

No.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, was not in favour of a fixed travelling allowance for officers of and below the rank of Inspector. The Superintendent, Railway Police, should be granted a fixed travelling allowance as the present rate was inadequate. Inspectors and lower ranks should get a single fare in addition to a pass.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, thought that there should certainly be a fixed system unless a room and kitchen were provided for the use of police officers on tour at stations.

Inspectors D. N. Mukerjee and S. C. Banerjee suggested that officers should get conveyance allowance as was given to the District Police. In matters of travelling allowance, Railway Police officers should also be treated equally with other Departments, namely, Railway Mail Service, Posts and Telegraphs, etc.

Assam.

The Assam Government were inclined to think, without committing themselves to definite figures, that some allowance—either a fixed travelling allowance or local allowance—was required in view of the unpopularity of the service.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, was of opinion that generous pay with duty allowance was preferable to fixed travelling allowance. Inspectors should get Rs. 20, Sub-Inspectors Rs. 10, head constable Rs. 5 and constables Rs. 3 per mensem as duty allowance which should count for leave and pension in the case of constables. Mr. Craven in 1912 had written in this connection that it was necessary to bear in mind that the cost of living in Assam and in Chittagong was heavier than in many parts of India. The climate was more malarious, and in Assam the country had not been fully developed and was in many places full of jungle. Other railway lines were more extensive than the Assam-Bengal Railway and gave more scope for effecting transfers. To counteract these drawbacks it was necessary to establish a feeling in the force that service in the Railway Police was far from being a punishment but a compliment and a temporary promotion to the officers selected and the only way to engender this feeling was by the sanction of a duty allowance.

Inspectors Syed Hashmatullah and U. C. Deb were in favour of a fixed travelling allowance. Officers and men should be allowed the same allowances as were drawn by officers of the Criminal Investigation Department in the province.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government stated that there was no system of fixed travelling allowance and no evidence had been placed before Government which suggested that the system would be beneficial.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, suggested that instead of the present arrangement by which officers and men got free passes, and drew travelling allowances for each day of over 8 hours that they were absent from headquarters they should travel on free passes as at present, but as travelling allowance they should also be given a single fare according to the class to which they were entitled. He was opposed to the system of fixed travelling allowance.

Mr. T. M. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Kharagpur, stated that there was a fixed system of travelling allowance on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, stated that there was no system of travelling allowance on the East Indian Railway. He was in favour of such a system and also of granting a conveyance allowance to enable officers to co-operate with the District Police, provided that some check was instituted to see that officers did move about in their jurisdictions. Under existing rules investigation was hampered.

Inspector Inder Sen Suchar stated that he was not in favour of any fixed system of travelling allowance, as it would be a form of discouragement for officers to go on tour which counted for so much in police efficiency. The present rate of travelling allowance was inadequate. Railway police officers were provided with a free pass for travelling in their jurisdiction and were allowed daily allowance according to the Civil Service Regulations, but passes on leave or on other railways were not granted. Passes also were not granted while travelling on duty according to the rank of the officer, e.g., a head constable though entitled to Inter-class fare according to the Civil Service Regulations, was only given a III class pass. Sub-Inspectors receiving more than Rs. 100 got only Inter-class pass, though they were entitled to II Class passes. The Railway Police should be given their travelling allowance according to the Civil Service Regulations, i.e., double fares on the days they travelled and halting allowance. The Railway Administrations should extend all the privileges of pass holders to the Railway Police. Fixed cycle allowance for all Sub-Inspectors as was granted to the District Police should also be granted. Their duties daily demanded their travelling to villages or to Courts in big towns, or to local police stations.

Inspector Fauzdar Narain Kuar was not in favour of any system of fixed travelling allowance.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, was not in favour of a fixed monthly travelling allowance though he considered the daily rates now in force were too small. Investigating officers had a grievance in the fact that if they went to Bombay, for instance, to carry on an investigation they were actually out of pocket, the reason being that a Sub-Inspector's daily allowance was one per cent. of his pay, or on an average about Re. 1 per day. He received a pass which carried him to Bombay and then he had his carriage to pay for, his hotel expenses and probably his enquiries might take him to two or three places in Bombay. The system was the same as if he was travelling in his own jurisdiction.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, was in favour of such a system for constables, but not for officers. This fixed travelling allowance should be given in addition to free passes.

Mr. Maybery, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Inspectors Glackan and Sharif Muhammad Khan, were not in favour of any such system.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqvi stated that, as a body, the officers were not in favour of a system of fixed travelling allowance for themselves but favoured such a system for constables and head constables because they had very little time to travel. Sometimes one constable might go out 8 or 9 times in a month compared with another constable who might have the opportunity of going out only once or twice. This led to quarrels and complaints which would automatically disappear with a system of fixed travelling allowance.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula was in favour of a fixed system of travelling allowance.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

No.

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, was not in favour of fixed travelling allowance.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, was not in favour of a fixed travelling allowance for any ranks of the subordinate police.

Sind.

Fixed travelling allowance at the rate of Rs. 40 per mensem is granted to Sub-Inspectors only.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, was in favour of such a system if the Superintendent of Police were given powers to place a man on daily allowance in case of his displaying too great a fondness for remaining at headquarters. The present system worked well.

Inspector Khan Sahab Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali, was of opinion that the present system was satisfactory. The introduction of a fixed allowance for the men would make them indifferent to going on duty.

Punjab.

No.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that he was personally in favour of a fixed travelling allowance both for officers and men, but he understood the general feeling in the force was against it.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent and Inspector Ghulam Dastgir, were in favour of fixed allowances for officers and men.

North-West Frontier Province.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, was not in favour of fixed travelling allowance for officers and men.

Khan Sahab Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, was also not in favour of the suggestion as he thought that such an arrangement would make them slack and disinclined to tour.

Question No. 22.—Are quarters provided for officers and men?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that all ranks up to Inspectors were supposed to be given free quarters but not gazetted officers. Where they had not been provided they were being built as opportunity occurred.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that everybody from Inspectors downwards was supplied with free quarters. A good deal still remained to be done in the way of supplying constables with family quarters, but generally speaking the Railway Police was ahead of the District Police in this respect.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that the question of accommodation had not received the attention it deserved from the Railway Administration. It caused a deal of inconvenience and had reacted unfairly on the work and discipline of the force. On the East Indian Railway there was accommodation for about 60%. On the Great Indian Peninsula Railway quarters at every station had been sanctioned and were in the course of being built.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi stated that house rent was given where there were no quarters. In the latter case officers and men were put to a lot of inconvenience and Government work suffered. The quarters supplied were small and unhealthy.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz agreed.

Bombay

Quarters or rent are provided for Inspectors and other subordinate ranks. Progress in building quarters is very slow.

Madras.

The witnesses stated that quarters were provided as far as possible for Inspectors and subordinate ranks; when they were not provided house rent was given.

Bengal

Quarters or house rent are provided. Quarters, however, for married constables are not provided. There are no quarters at Sealdah where it is essential that there should be. Quarters, however, cannot be secured for Sub-Inspectors in that neighbourhood for less than Rs. 50 per mensem but the allowance is only Rs. 15 so they live 5 or 6 miles away.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General of Police, stated that endeavours were being made to get married quarters for all police officers, but want of funds hampered progress.

Assam

Generally quarters are provided and are usually good. Married constables' quarters are badly needed at some places.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government stated that 37% of the force on the East Indian Railway and Bengal and North-Western Railway and 8% on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway were not provided with quarters. Government considered it important that quarters should be provided as soon as financial conditions permitted.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that few officers' quarters had been provided; but those officers who had not been provided with quarters were paid house rent, which was an unsatisfactory arrangement. It was essential that Railway Police officers should be given quarters in close proximity to the railway station. In most places, constables had been provided with barracks.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that quarters had been provided, but in some instances officers lived in hired houses. Lately the Agent of the Bengal-Nagpur Railway had shewn a disinclination to provide quarters.

Inspector Indar Sen Sachar stated that the present arrangements were inadequate. Most of the officers had not been provided with quarters at all. Constables' barracks were located in units of menials' quarters which were very unhealthy and unsatisfactory in the way of accommodation. Family quarters were not provided for constables or head constables.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that with the exception of gazetted officers and Indian Inspectors all the Railway Police were supplied with quarters or house rent in lieu thereof.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi stated that generally quarters were not provided but officers drew house rent.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Yes.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that quarters were provided but were far from all that could be desired.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that the question of quarters for the Railway Police was as acute as ever and it was a factor which was having a very bad effect on the morale of the force. The North-Western Railway objected to the Sind type of quarters for head constables and constables. It had been pointed out that the Railway Police employed in Sind could not be housed in quarters of an inferior type to those constructed for the District Police, nor was it fair to give them quarters built for the menial staff of the Railway. The North-Western Railway would not agree to the Public Works Department constructing quarters on railway land and at most stations the railway having acquired all available land near the station sites could only be obtained at a considerable distance which was objectionable: firstly, because the Police were not close to their work, and secondly the men were against leaving their families in isolated localities. The North-

Western Railway recently called for a list of police quarters needed on the Sind Section. This had been sent in and was being considered by the Agent. If the Railway Police were to be brought up to a high standard of efficiency and if the right type of men were to be attracted it was necessary to build quarters for the Railway Police without delay. Running rooms at engine-changing stations were also a desideratum. Men travelling in charge of passenger trains had to lie about the platform at the end of their beat as there was no accommodation for them. The Locomotive Department provided Running Rooms for their firemen and *khalasis* and did not turn them out to shift for themselves.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that generally quarters were provided for officers and men but they were not satisfactory. The quarters should be built according to standard plans at all police stations and outposts.

Punjab.

Yes.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that quarters were provided for upper and lower subordinates and on a much better scale than was the case with the District Police.

North-West Frontier Province.

The Deputy Superintendent in charge has no house. The Inspector receives house rent. Other members of the force are provided with quarters.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General of Police, was of opinion that all officers including the Deputy Superintendent of Police should receive quarters.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that the number of married quarters at police stations was limited. Married quarters should be provided for at least three-fourths of the number of constables posted to a police station. Work would be facilitated if all officers including the Deputy Superintendent had quarters provided in the railway colony attached to stations.

Question No. 23.—Is life in the Railway Police service regarded as unhealthy?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, was very doubtful about this point. The returns showed less sickness than in the case of the District Police, but service in the Armed Police was said to be particularly unhealthy.

Inspector Murphy stated that officers were not sure of their meals.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that life in the Railway Police was considered unhealthy as compared with the District Police. Officers and men complained of acute dyspepsia and shattered nerves owing to the wear and tear of life.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi agreed and was of opinion that members of the force should be transferred to the District Police after a fixed period, say five years, if they so desired because of bad health.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated that the smoke and noise of engines, the uproar of shunting trains and the ringing of bells at night did not allow of sound sleep which told upon the health.

Inspector Farrant merely mentioned that life in the Railway Police was regarded as unhealthy.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shunker did not think that this was the case.

Bombay.

No.

Madras.

None of the witnesses thought that the Railway Police service was regarded as unhealthy.

Bengal.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent of Police, Howrah, and *Inspector D. N. Mukerjee* stated that life in the Railway Police was not unhealthy.

Mr. Ezecheli, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, and *Inspector S. C. Banerjee* disagreed, as the officers and men often had meals at irregular hours and frequently had to do without cooked food. They had constant railway journeys, night work and unhealthy stations.

Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that work in the Railway Police was generally considered unhealthy. Want of exercise, irregular meals, night work and nerve strain soon led to the breakdown of health. Piles, constipation, dyspepsia and fever were very common. Proper food was not often available and police officers had to sleep in waiting rooms or on the platform when out on the line.

Inspector Hashmatullah stated that it was regarded as unhealthy because the staff was inadequate and had to work day and night without getting sound sleep and food at proper hours. The daily allowance which the Railway Police received did not meet their actual expenses when out on the line.

Inspector Upendra Chandra Deb mentioned that constant journeys by rail by night and day without proper sleep, food and bath broke down one's health.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government stated they had no reason to believe that life in the Railway Police was regarded as unhealthy.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khagpur, Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, and Inspector Fousdar Narayan Kaur agreed with the Bihar Government.

Inspector Indur Sen Sachar stated that life in the Railway Police was unhealthy (1) for want of quarters; (2) owing to constant travelling.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police stated that life in the Railway Police service was regarded as unhealthy.

Messrs. Hurst, Mayberry and Glackan agreed. The latter ascribed it to excessive travelling and irregular meals.

Inspector Sharif Md. Khan and Sub-Inspector Baij Nath Kaula stated that the service was regarded as unhealthy but gave no reasons.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi stated that the service was considered unhealthy. Complaints of indigestion and insufficient rest affected the health. On the Bengal-Nagpur Railway, railway police officers had to work from 12 to 18 hours a day.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, was of opinion that service in the Railway Police was not unhealthy.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that judging by admissions to hospital since December 1920 life in the Railway Police was far more healthy than in the District Police.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that owing to want of quarters the men were subjected to exposure which caused cases of pneumonia, etc.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that the life was considered unhealthy on account of constant travelling.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that gazetted officers considered that life in the Railway Police Service was unhealthy, but he was not aware that the lower ranks regarded it as such.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that life in the Railway Police service was regarded as unhealthy.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir agreed and stated that this was especially the opinion in the case of the lower subordinates.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that life in the Railway Police service was regarded as unhealthy and in consequence of sedentary occupation premature decay was noticeable.

Question No. 24.—Are punishments or rewards more frequent than in the District Police?

United Provinces.

The conditions are about equal.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi was of opinion that both were more frequent because the faults and shortcomings of officers and men were open to easy detection.

Bombay.

Equal.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that rewards were more frequent but punishments were equal.

Madras.

The witnesses stated that there was no material difference.

Bengal.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, and Inspectors Mukerjee and Banerjee thought that they were equal.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, said that there were fewer punishments and rewards and this statement was based on figures and experience in two districts.

Assam.

The witnesses stated that there was no material difference.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that rewards were paid much more frequently in the Railway Police than in the District Police. As regards punishments, he did not think there was much difference.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, and Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, stated that there was no great difference in either respects.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that rewards were few. There was not much difference between the District and the Railway Police in the matter of punishments.

Central Provinces.

The witnesses generally were of opinion that they were about the same.

Inspector Sharif Mahomed Khan stated that rewards were less in the Railway Police than in the District Police.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi agreed and stated that punishments were more frequent, Constables got little time for rest and being on duty for more than 12 hours in the day were generally found neglecting their work, hence the number of punishments.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, did not think there was any difference.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that supervision being close, punishments and rewards were both somewhat heavier in the Railway Police than in the District Police.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, did not think that punishments or rewards were more frequent than in the District Police, although his information was not based on statistics.

Inspector Khan Saheb Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali was of opinion that both were more frequent than in the District Police.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that punishments were more frequent in the Railway Police than in the District Police. Conditions in the Railway Police were not

favourable to discipline, but there had been a marked improvement during the past three years. The life was rather demoralising. The Railway Police were in close contact with the railway staff, which was very undisciplined. Further, life in small outposts was unfavourable to discipline. Rewards had been on the same scale as in districts, but during the past year had become more frequent.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, and Inspector Ghulam Dastgir, were of opinion that punishments and rewards were more frequent than in the District Police.

North-West Frontier Province.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, was of opinion that the general conduct of the Railway Police was as good as that of the District Police.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that rewards were less frequent than in the District Police while punishments were greater in number. Much however depended on the temperament of the officer in charge.

Question No. 25.—Are you of opinion that the present allocation, strength and working of the police are satisfactory? In what particulars, if any, are alterations required?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that as regards allocation, conditions varied a great deal. There were too many small stations on the metre-gauge system and the strength could be much better utilized. As regards allocation at certain stations it was evident that the force was under strength. Men were chiefly wanted for patrolling, platform duty and investigations. There was necessity for checking outsiders trespassing on platforms and in stations areas to a greater extent than had hitherto been the case. Trains had increased since the original allocation was fixed. The amount of goods carried had greatly increased in volume and investigation work had also increased. The investigation of crimes was not very satisfactory. There was a lack of supervision on the part of superior officers and the investigation work of Sub-Inspectors required much more attention at their hands. In the Railway Police the system was quite different from that in the District Police. (For his remarks on Divisional Inspectors, see question 18.)

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, was of opinion that the allocation generally was inadequate and did not allow of any surplus to cope with outbreaks of crime or to provide adequate train guards. More men were certainly required, but he did not consider any reduction in outposts (in Section "A" at any rate) could be effected. The number of police stations and outposts, was satisfactory. The existing strength was inadequate, the deficiency ranging in "A" Section from 25 % on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway to 40 % on the East Indian Railway. There was no reserve at present to meet any special demands, while on occasions such as bathing fairs, considerable assistance had to be obtained from the District Police which was not a satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, stated that the strength was altogether inadequate. Railway traffic had gone up by leaps and bounds but the strength of the Railway Police had not increased in the same proportion. This could be proved by railway records which would show that the proportion of police to passengers and tons of merchandise carried was far less than it was 20 years ago. In recent years railways had opened new marshalling yards and extended the existing ones, but the Railway Police had not been strengthened accordingly. He thought that men were frittered away in making enquiries into missing goods cases, etc. Although the police were not supposed to make enquiries unless there was good reason to suspect a theft, that, however, was a very vague expression. In a wagon arriving with shortage a theft could always be suspected. As a matter of fact the United Provinces Police suspected about 100 % more thefts than the Punjab Police. The rules were not very clear and left a good deal of licence to individual officers.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, was of opinion that the strength was far too small. Men could not be found when urgently needed for guarding goods trains, patrolling yards, *mela* duties, viceregal protection duties, etc., without withdrawing them from passenger halls and other duties. The small reserve was always used up for leave vacancies. The rules defined the police duties sufficiently clearly except possibly in the case of missing goods in which the rules should be made the same all over India. It should be definitely decided what constituted a seal-intact shortage theft and a seal-intact shortage not amounting to theft.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, "C" Section, said that the force was considerably undermanned, particularly in the police stations. It would not help to abolish small outposts and add the men to the larger ones as that would leave a long length of line without any Railway Police at all.

Inspector Macleod mentioned that the strength was far below requirements. Often when he had prisoners in the lock-up he had not got sufficient men to escort them to the court and had to break up the duties on the platform for this purpose. The staff for patrol work was also insufficient.

Inspector Murray said that more men were wanted for important junctions—especially for night patrol and also for patrolling in goods yards, although, strictly speaking, that was not a part of the duty of the police at present. There were not sufficient men for platform duty. The staff needed increase all round.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent of Railway Police, Agra, was of opinion that the present allocation, strength and working of the Railway Police was not satisfactory. Additions were required in all directions. A comprehensive scheme for increasing the strength had been submitted to Government and he urged that the recommendations made in that report should be sanctioned *en bloc*. Cogent reasons had been given to which he had nothing to add. That the present force was understaffed and undermanned admitted of no doubt. Some relief in the clerical work was desirable. Case diaries need not be written in petty cases. Charge sheets, or final reports, as the case might be, should be sent to courts, giving a brief and intelligible account of the investigations made. Investigating officers might be given private note-books to note important points and refresh their memories when filling in the above forms. The majority of Divisional Inspectors in charge of Railway Police divisions were more or less ignorant of law and were not able to make investigations or supervise crime in an adequate manner. That was due more to a faulty system than the individuals themselves as they received no training in those duties. Inspectors and Sergeants should be sent to a training school and trained on the same lines as Sub-Inspectors, before being drafted to the Railway Police. Divisional Inspectors should be replaced by competent gazetted officers in charge of sub-divisions, and each officer should be given an office staff and a Sub-Inspector as his reader. He would be in independent charge of his sub-division, dealing direct with various railway officers within his charge subject to the control and supervision of a Deputy Inspector-General or senior Superintendent of Railway Police. His pay and allowances should be on a par with those of a District Traffic Superintendent on the railway and he should be given a carriage to enable him to travel about his jurisdiction frequently.

Inspector Farrant considered that a 40 % increase on the present strength was necessary.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi stated that a 50 % increase in the number of constables and head constables was absolutely necessary in order to get work done efficiently. The present Punjab system which did away with the Divisional Inspector was a sound system. At present the routine work was excessive. The main duty of the Divisional Inspector was to supervise investigation but he was unable to do it. Only important cases should be reported to the Superintendent, or to the Deputy Inspector-General and the gazetted officer should be allowed to file papers with himself. The District Police Sub-Inspector made a better investigation than the Railway Police officer because the latter came direct from the training school and had no experience. If he were posted to the Railway Police after five or six months' experience in the District Police he would do better work. Special men should be drafted from the District Police into the Railway Police.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz did not consider that the allocation strength or working was satisfactory. The majority of the constables should be literate and particularly should know English. No one should be kept for more than five years in the Railway Police. Indian Circle Inspectors should be appointed to work as Divisional Inspectors. Platform duty should only be performed by head constables posted for the purpose and Sub-Inspectors should be relieved of this duty in order to enable them to devote themselves solely to dealing with crime and investigation.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shunker was of opinion that the allocation was insufficient for the Railway Police adequately to perform the multifarious duties entrusted to them.

See also replies to question 18.

Bombay.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that the allocation and strength had recently been modified by a reduction in the number of police stations and outposts and constables and an increase in the number of head constables, but it was too early to say how the new arrangement would work. The strength provided was only sufficient for normal conditions.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, was of opinion that the strength was insufficient. A large increase would be necessary unless some mechanical means could be devised for securing wagons. There were two European Inspectors and two Indian Inspectors on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway. European Inspectors were not so good as Indians for investigations but Europeans were wanted for the regulation of traffic and for dealing with European railway subordinates. He could do with twice the number of men that he had. He would also like an Assistant Superintendent.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that more men were necessary to cope with running goods train thefts and also for places like Victoria Terminus and Kalyan. Assistant Superintendents or Deputy Superintendents should be appointed as Sub-Divisional Police Officer on the railway to supervise investigations while the European Inspectors should be utilized to cases of emergency, strikes, regulation of traffic and platform duty.

Inspector Bird stated that men employed on platform duties were interchangeable with the staff employed on investigations. As a rule, the illiterate men were kept on platform duty. Literates received an allowance. A separate detective staff was wanted.

Sub-Inspector Rege said that the present staff was insufficient owing to the increase in the number of running train thefts. The number of Sub-Inspectors at Victoria Terminus should be increased.

Madras.

The witnesses were of opinion that the present arrangements were generally satisfactory except at a few stations, the importance of which had recently increased.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General, stated that in some respects the force was undermanned and in others over-manned. There was no armed reserve and application had to be made to the District Police for help when necessity arose. This was not a satisfactory arrangement otherwise the strength was sufficient. Superintendents had the power to put outposts where they liked.

Bengal.

Mr. Hyle, Inspector-General of Police, was of opinion that only a larger detective force was necessary and that it would not be necessary largely to increase the station staff though possibly the platform staff at Howrah needed to be increased.

Mr. Bralley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, said that the allocation was satisfactory, but strength was insufficient and an increase in the investigating staff was needed at Howrah, Asansol, Sitarampur and Burdwan. The platform police at Howrah were far below the needs of so large and open a station. There was no force to draw upon in case of emergencies. A separate staff for seal-checking should also be provided. Provision of a force for train guard duty was necessary and a sick and off-duty reserve should also be provided. The present strength of platform police at Howrah was two Inspectors, nine Sergeants, three head constables and 36 constables.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent of Railway Police, Sealdah, was of opinion that more Sub-Inspectors were required as, excepting at Sealdah, there was only one at each police station.

Inspector D. N. Mukerjee stated that the force was undermanned. There was no force available for any emergent work without drawing men from already undermanned police stations. Working could not be called satisfactory. The delay in the reporting of cases, want of facility in localizing crime, the unreliability of guards and other railway employees, the tendency of officers to shift the responsibility from one jurisdiction to another, the unnecessary interference of railway subordinates and the inefficiency of the Watch and Ward staff hampered the working of the police. Regarding the unreliability of guards and also the interference of the railway subordinates an instance occurred at Asansol where it was suspected that many thefts were taking place in the transshipment yards. A special Sub-Inspector about whose honesty and integrity there could be no doubt was deputed there. Immediately on his arrival the coolies were made to strike and it was found later that the Station Superintendent was in a way concerned as he had the contract for the handling of goods.

Inspector S. C. Banarjee of the Saidpur section of the Eastern Bengal Railway thought that the working was not satisfactory owing to the force being under strength.

Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, pointed out that the headquarters of the Superintendent was at the extreme end of his charge which entailed many difficulties as he had no Assistant. The Assam Government was of opinion that as long as the jurisdiction remained as it was, Chittagong was the most suitable headquarters for the Superintendent but there should be a Deputy Superintendent to assist him. Questioned by the Committee, Mr. Giles stated that his Government accepted the principle that the Police Administration should be coterminous with provincial boundaries but with modifications. The Governor desired that one portion (see question 35) should be transferred to Bengal because it could be easily administered by the Bengal Police as the criminals came from their jurisdiction.

Mr. Giles was also of opinion that the strength of constables of some police stations was inadequate. There were not sufficient constables to patrol all night trains. He suggested the opening of three more beat posts with one head constable and four constables at Ashuganj, Sitakund and Titabar.

Inspector Hashmatullah thought the present allocation satisfactory, but the strength inadequate, especially at Laksam, Bhairab, Srimangal and Tinsukhia. The patrol force should be considerably increased in order to protect all night trains. The supervising staff for the patrol force should also be increased. The investigating staff should be increased as at present there was only one officer at all stations. Some stations had no head constables to do the office work. The reserve should be increased to at least 20% of the total force as the sanctioned staff was quite insufficient.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government was of opinion that the present allocation and strength of the police force was not satisfactory on the East Indian Railway and Bengal and North-Western Railways and tendered copies of the recent official correspondence on the subject which showed the revised scheme which had been approved in principle by the Government and was awaiting the allotment of funds. On the Bengal and North-Western Railway, the revision of the jurisdiction of certain police stations, together with a small addition to the staff, was under consideration which when sanctioned would ensure more satisfactory working.

Mr Macrae, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, stated that the finding of the Punjab Police Committee that three railway investigations were equal to about one ordinary district investigation, was, roughly speaking, correct. The seal checking staff of 8 Sub-Inspectors, 4 head constables and 8 constables contained so many Sub-Inspectors because seal-checking by constables was useless.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that the new allocation of the force which had just been sanctioned, was satisfactory. The proposed sanctioned strength was also satisfactory. The working would improve when the new proposed strength was sanctioned. The Bihar Government was in favour of largely increasing the investigating staff, and abolishing the platform staff in certain stations where there were few cases. The proposals provided for the establishment of a detective branch.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that the Railway Police on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway were about to be reorganized, when the existing defects would be removed.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, was of opinion that the staff was inadequate.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that if the strength of the Railway Police were fixed according to the recommendations of the Police Commission of 1902-03, which recommended that a section of line varying in length with local circumstances, but never greatly exceeding 100 miles, should form the charge of a railway police sub-inspector, and that the staff should be sufficiently strong to allow of either a constable or head constable being sent to travel in every train, the present force would require to be doubled. A greater number of head constables and sub-inspectors would also be required for supervision. As matters stood, there was not sufficient staff to allow one officer to be in the police station to attend to urgent matters which might be reported by day or by night which was essential in all police stations, and more especially in a railway police station, where the travelling public had no time to wait. He therefore recommended that there should be at least two head constables at each police station, who would hold charge of the station diary, attend to miscellaneous duties and inform the sub-inspector in cases of importance. No police station should have less than two sub-inspectors attached to it. It should be one of the duties of these sub-inspectors to be present at the platform at the time of important trains in uniform. The local conditions of the Bengal and North-Western Railway demanded that the jurisdiction of one police station should not be more than 50 miles in length considering the slow speed of trains and the small number of trains available. Inspectors on the Bengal and North-Western Railway had very long jurisdictions to control. In order to be able to cope with the work, an Inspector had, on an average, to spend 27 days a month on tour. Another Circle Inspector's jurisdiction should be created on the Bengal and North-Western Railway in Bihar.

Inspector Fauzdar Narain Kuar was of opinion that the allocation, strength and working were satisfactory.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that the strength of the force was inadequate while more station houses were required. All railway policemen should be literate men. There were 83 head constables and 140 constables literate out of a total strength of 154 head constables and 370 constables, or roughly 40%. There were two classes A and B: A (literate) and B (illiterate) employed for guard duty. A better class of man was required for the Railway Police than for the District Police for the investigation of technical crime, particularly accidents and such matters. There were 7 police stations on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway and 14 on the Great Indian Peninsula, East Indian Railway and Indian Midland Railway. The total mileage was as follows:—on the Great Indian Peninsula 1,542 miles; East Indian Railway 119; Indian Midland Railway 38; and Bengal-Nagpur Railway 1,270; or a total of about 3,000 miles which made an average of one thana for every 100 miles and one Superintendent for every 1,500 miles. He would prefer a separate Deputy Inspector-General for Railways as work had increased and the Inspector-General might know nothing about railway work. Also if there were two Superintendents, a Deputy Inspector-General would make them pull together. The Railway Police did not assist the Criminal Investigation Department in watching criminals. That was done by the District Police.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, considered that the allocation and working was satisfactory but that the strength should be increased.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, suggested that an increase was wanted in the investigating and preventive staff. The police performed the duty of patrolling yards at large stations without having any sanctioned staff for the duty. It was not recognized as one

of the duties of the Railway Police but it should be so recognized, excluding the watch and ward of the goods shed.

Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan stated that neither the allocation strength nor the working of the Railway Police was satisfactory. Illiterate head constables and constables were working in the Railway Police. The present system of appointing Divisional Inspectors from Reserve Inspectors was unsatisfactory. At the beginning of their service they passed through a Law examination and then throughout the remainder of their service remained attached to the Police Lines where they got no further training in Law or investigation work. For this reason the present system was very defective. In order to have better supervision over the trained class of Sub-Inspectors and also co-operation, improvements with respect to crime and its prevention, 3 experienced gazetted officers should be appointed in place of the 4 Divisional Inspectors and one Deputy Superintendent working at present. The investigation of all important cases should remain in the hands of a detective staff. The strength was not sufficient. New stations should be opened.

Sub-Inspector Muzhar Naqi stated that the strength, allocation, and working were not satisfactory. The duties of the Railway Police were numerous while the staff was inadequate and every officer had to work from 12 to 18 hours every day. The allocation and strength required alteration and constables specially should not be required to work more than 8 hours.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula considered that the allocation and working were satisfactory, but the strength was inadequate and illiterate constables and head constables should not be appointed. At present constables were not required to do more than 12 hours a day.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, considered that it was very necessary for at least one constable to be posted at every station as thieves quickly learned at what stations there were no police and entrained and alighted at those stations. There was nothing for constables to do if concentrated.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, compared the strength of the force under him with that sanctioned for nearly the same length of line in the United Provinces.

Rajputana.	United Provinces.
1 Superintendent,	1 Superintendent,
1 Deputy Superintendent,	1 Deputy Superintendent,
5 Inspectors,	6 Inspectors,
1 Sergeant,	9 Sergeants,
26 Sub-Inspectors,	35 Sub-Inspectors,
190 Head constables, and	44 Head constables, and
426 Constables.	428 Constables.

He said that an increase was wanted in the Training Reserve and in Sub-Inspectors.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, thought that the strength was insufficient but that until quarters were provided it was not advisable to increase the present force. There was also a strong case for an Office Superintendent on the Sind Railways to relieve the Superintendent of routine work. He understood that an Office Superintendent had been recommended by the Inspector-General for certain districts as well as for Railway Police offices and he hoped that the scheme would be sanctioned. A Deputy Superintendent of Police as a Sub-Divisional Officer on the plan in force in the Punjab Railways was also required to take charge of the Northern section of the Sind Railways. A special investigating staff under an Inspector was essential to deal with important cases and to assist in the prevention of crime. An extra staff for the two new police stations opened was also required.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali did not consider that the allocation strength and working of the police were satisfactory. The force should be strengthened and the personnel improved. Uneducated men should not be enlisted.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that the allocation was satisfactory and on the whole the present strength of the force was sufficient for the duties to which it had been restricted by Government. The casualty reserve, however, was insufficient and should be about 22½ % of the men on fixed duties instead of the 15 % as at present allowed. The strength of the Central Investigating Agency also required augmentation. There should be a Deputy Superintendent of Police allotted to it and an increase of one Inspector, two Sub-

Inspectors and ten constables. The present strength was 3 Inspectors, 4 Sub-Inspectors and 50 constables. The working of the Railway Police was capable of much improvement. Investigations were unscientific and often perfunctory. The remedy lay in the successful development of the Central Investigating Agency. The chief defect in investigating officers was want of stratagem, resource and initiative. In the case of a running goods train theft, for instance, the ordinary station house officer would record the statements of the guard of the train and of the engine driver and then after a day or two when there was no more news return the case as untraced. He probably never thought of getting into touch with the gangmen who could give valuable information. There were about 10 gangmen to the mile who looked after the permanent way. They would know exactly where the sacks had been thrown out. They would find the traces in the morning. Recently a case occurred in Khanpur in which a gangman was in touch with the Sub-Inspector who was thus able to get on to the track of the culprits. He actually arrested 4 thieves and recovered the stolen property. One of the thieves was an *ex*-railway police constable. The ordinary station house officer would not have taken all that trouble. He would have said he could not carry on with the gangmen, that they would not listen to him or do anything. The Railway Police officer would not record as much in the case diaries of a hundred cases as a District Police officer would record in his diary in a single case. Station house officers adopted a *non possumus* attitude, which had led him to push investigations through the Central Investigating Agency. He had taken ordinary *thanadars* and had placed them under inspectors in order to afford them good experience of protracted investigations. The ordinary officer, for instance, would not attempt to pick up clues from finger impressions. Recently a dead body was found in suspicious circumstances on the railway line and was buried without the finger impressions having been taken. It was the fault of the Sub-Inspector whom he considered to be one of the best men in the service. He had however neglected an elementary principle of investigation. Professionally the Railway Police officer was less educated than the District Police officer, who frequently took up investigations which ran into 3 or 4 months and learned the importance of such matters. The Railway Police were seldom confronted with such cases, and even if they were, they would not have sufficient time to carry them through. Few of the Railway Police sub-inspectors came from the District Police, the majority being promoted subordinates because Railway Police work was of a very technical nature and the district officer was not always a success when transferred to the Railway Police. The length of line under Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, was about 1,300 miles. It was not too much for a man of his position. The present arrangements suited the circumstances of the province. He found that he could not do what he wanted if he had two Superintendents under him, and their charges divided into two districts. He would have to pay much more deference to their opinions than to those of junior officers. He could now concentrate his whole available reserve on any troublesome section which would not be possible under the district system. He preferred an autocracy because one man was responsible for the work of the whole provincial system.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that the allocation, strength and working of the police was satisfactory.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that the allocation was satisfactory. The strength was also satisfactory except in the case of the Central Investigating Agency and the Reserve Police. The work, though not bad, could yet be much improved. The remedy lay in the development of the Central Investigating Agency.

North-West Frontier Province.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, stated that the clerical and reserve staff was insufficient. More Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors and head constables were also required.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, was of opinion that the allocation strength and working were for the most part satisfactory. The strength, however, was insufficient in that there was very little provision for the Railway Police office for which the sanctioned strength was 2 head constables and one foot constable. At least 4 head constables and 4 foot constables were required to run the office properly.

Question No. 26.—What railway police reserve is there, and have you any proposals to make regarding the sufficiency or allocation of the police reserves on the railway or railways with which you are connected.

United Provinces.

15 % reserve for vacancies.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, did not consider it necessary to have a special reserve force for the Railway Police. Most of the duties which had to be performed on occasions when such a force was required could be done equally well by the District Police and the special reserve police would be wasted at other times.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, suggested that the reserve should be fixed after determining all requirements under law and order duties, seal-checking and train guards. In "A" section a paper reserve was swallowed up in permanent duties owing to increased demands. For *mela* the Railway Police had to call on the District Police which was not satisfactory. The Railway Police in the United Provinces had not increased *pari passu* with the expansion of the railways. The chief requirement was men for *mela* duty when the demands for extra police were very heavy.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, said that a reserve was required for *mela* duty and also for outbreaks of crime. There was a small regular reserve for leave and casualty which was a paper reserve as the men were always on duty.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that there was no railway police reserve but it was apparent that one was needed. The question had been included in the scheme presented to Government and was at present under consideration, *vide* his reply to question No. 25.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi was of opinion that there should be a reserve of sub-inspectors, head constables and constables at the head-quarter stations of Superintendents of Railway Police, to relieve those on the sick list, leave, etc. This reserve should be at the ratio of 25% of the total number of officers and men posted at police stations and outposts, and should consist of a batch of officers and men with detective ability so that their services might be utilized in the prevention and detection of crime.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz was of opinion that there should be a reserve force in the Railway Police for emergencies.

Bombay.

15% of the total strength of constables. The reserve is located at head-quarters but can be used at discretion. It is sufficient for normal requirements. There is a separate training and leave reserve.

Witnesses were of opinion that more men were required for frequent railway strikes, running goods train thefts, passenger train guards, etc.

Madras.

The witnesses stated that there was a vacancy reserve of 1½%

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General of Police, was of opinion that an armed reserve force to put down crimes of a violent character was absolutely necessary. He had recommended the abolition of the 15 % reserve, the savings to be devoted to increased pay.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, stated that for *mela* duty the Railway Police indented on the District Police which was a better system than maintaining a large railway police reserve for which no work could be found at ordinary times.

Inspector Doraiswamy considered that the present reserve was sufficient.

Bengal.

There is the ordinary leave and vacancy reserve of 15 %.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General, was of opinion that the reserve should be converted solely into a leave reserve. Last year proposals were sent up for an additional force of 2 Inspectors, 36 head constables and 106 constables but Government did not accept them.

Mr. Simpson, Deputy Inspector-General, Burdwan Range, advocated a reserve of officers and men which could be utilized where required.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, stated there was a reserve of 1 sergeant, 5 sub-inspectors, 6 head constables and 56 constables. This was a leave reserve, but leave could not be granted to this extent owing to the urgent calls which had to be met. If the force were increased as suggested in his reply to question 25 the present proportion of reserve would suffice.

Mr. Ezekiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, said that he had no reserve except for leave and no other reserve was necessary. There was always the District Police reserve to draw upon which was meant to meet trouble.

Inspector D. N. Mukharji was of opinion that the reserve for the East Indian Railway was insufficient for emergencies. Each circle should have a reserve for sickness. The increase in the reserve referred to by the Inspector-General was intended to cope with an outbreak of thefts of railway fittings on the East Indian Railway.

Inspector S. C. Bamarji of the Saidpur section of the Eastern Bengal Railway, stated that the reserve was insufficient to fill leave vacancies.

Assam.

There is the ordinary leave and vacancy reserve of 15 %.

The Assam Government was of opinion that there should be a reserve for emergencies and it should be armed ; such an armed reserve would probably be useful in the case of strikes when workers or property required protection.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, was of opinion that the reserve was inadequate. He had already recommended for an increase of 18 %. The railway frequently asked the Superintendent, Railway Police, to supply guards for the transfer of, or for the temporary guarding of, cash which could not be complied with while the Railway Police had no armed force. He suggested a force of one British sergeant, two head constables and 25 constables to be stationed at Lumding or some other central place.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government stated that the strength of the existing railway police reserve was as follows :—

East Indian Railway.—2 Sub-Inspectors.

8 Head constables.

43 Constables.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.—3 Sub-Inspectors.

29 Constables.

The Bihar and Orissa Government considered that the reserves on the East Indian Railway and Bengal and North-Western Railway were inadequate, but the necessary provision in that connection had been made in the new scheme mentioned in answer to question 25. The reserve on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway was considered to be adequate.

Mr. Macrae, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, stated that the reserve was a leave reserve. The Railway Police had no emergency reserve, but relied on the District Police entirely in the matter.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that the proposed reserve of 6 sub-inspectors, 2 illiterate head constables and 53 constables when sanctioned would be sufficient for his needs.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that the reserve at Khargpur was sufficient for ordinary purposes, but during *melas*, it was insufficient, and police stations were denuded to find men. The reserve of writer head constables was also insufficient.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that the railway police force was required to cope with the rush of pilgrims at fair and bathing festivals, which were of frequent occurrence on the Bengal and North-Western Railway, and there should be a provision in the reserve to meet that demand.

Inspector Fousdar Narain Kuar stated that the reserve was inadequate and should be increased.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that there was only a leave reserve and no other reserve was required under the system existing in the Central Provinces.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, considered that this reserve should be increased. In emergencies the Railway Police drew on the District Police Reserves and on the Armed Police maintained in certain districts.

Messrs. Mayberry, Glackan, Sharif Muhammad Khan, Mazhar Naji and Baijnath Kaula made no suggestions.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the reserve was 7 % of the total force. It should be increased to 15 % of the total number of head constables and constables. It was not purely a leave reserve but could be called upon in special cases. It was not strong enough. About half the reserve was required for escort duty.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General of Railway Police, stated that the reserve had been fixed at too low a standard to meet the requirements of leave, sickness and recruits under training. An increase was needed in the reserve for recruits and the number of sub-inspectors was not sufficient. The emergency reserve was fixed at 2 head constables and 20 constables,

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that there was no reserve. There should be a reserve at Karachi and Sukkur where there were large railway workshops. At present when his constables went on leave their places were left vacant or temporary men were taken on as acting constables. They were sent to the reserve to learn their work.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that the strength of the reserve was inadequate and should be fixed at 15% of the strength as on account of constant travelling the men frequently went sick. There should also be a reserve of sub-inspectors.

Punjab.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General, stated that the question of increasing the reserve had been before Government within the last two years, and last year they had definitely rejected the proposals for increase in the percentage of the casualty reserve. He did not think that he could recommend a general increase to the casualty reserve. At present the 15 % reserve was sufficient for the permanent duties of the police.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that the casualty reserve was insufficient and should be about 22½% of the men on fixed duties instead of 15% as at present. Government, however, had rejected his proposals in this respect. There was also an emergency reserve of 4 head constables and 50 constables which was not sufficient to cope with the extra duties thrown upon the force by viceregal and gubernatorial tours, fairs, etc. He recommended that the emergency reserve should be increased to a strength of 1 sub-inspector, 6 head constables and 75 constables.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that in his jurisdiction, there was a reserve of 15 constables, but they had been posted to the different police stations according to their importance. He suggested an increase of 2 head constables and 15 constables to allow the Sub-Divisional Officer freely to utilize their services for the suppression of epidemics of crime and for other emergencies.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that the present reserve was 15% besides the emergency reserve of 4 head constables and 50 constables. He was of opinion that 1 sub-inspector, 10 head constables and 100 constables should be added.

North-West Frontier Province.

There is a reserve of 29 constables in addition to permanent postings to replace men sick in hospital, on leave, deputed to Police Training School and employed in office.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that on an average there were seldom 3 to 4 men off duty in the reserve which was insufficient. Apart from the strength proposed for the office establishment in Question 25, the strength should be raised by 1 inspector, 2 sub-inspectors, 6 head constables and 20 constables. Out of this force a detective staff could be provided consisting of 1 inspector, 2 sub-inspectors, 4 head constables and 8 foot constables, leaving a reserve of 2 head constables and 12 men.

Question No. 27.—Is there any want of co-operation between the members of the railway staff and the railway police, and are you aware of any ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that want of co-operation manifested itself in investigation work chiefly because the railway police very often saw things from a different standpoint than the subordinate railway officials—For many years the Railway Administration had wanted their own Railway Police—a proposal he was directly opposed to. The solution was to get a better class of controlling officers, Assistant Superintendents of Police in charge of larger divisions living in closer touch with district railway officials.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that as regards subordinates, it was inevitable that there should be want of co-operation and ill-feeling. If a railway policeman was doing his job he would be trying to discover what the railwaymen wanted to hide. As regards subordinates a good deal of hostility existed and there seemed to be no cure for it.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, stated that the objects of the two departments were totally different, and that it must be admitted that the greater proportion of thefts of goods was committed by the railway staff and the object of the railway police was to prevent this commission, so that among the subordinate staff there could not be any co-operation. "I never would allow my men to go into the goods sheds. If they did friction was inevitable."

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that ordinarily there was no want of co-operation, but it was difficult to get reliable information from railway subordinates where other Railway subordinates were concerned.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent, stated that there was always a risk of trouble because if the police found anything against the railway subordinates in their investigation and reported adversely, the other members of the department became annoyed. Strikes had occurred when the police tried to stop the *palludars* thieving.

Inspector Macleod stated that he did not experience any want of co-operation in Lucknow.

Inspector Murphy stated that it was very hard to get assistance from railway people as their men were generally concerned in the cases.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that there was want of co-operation. The majority of the dishonest subordinate railway staff regarded the railway police as personal enemies and went out of their way to hinder them in carrying out their duties. Much could be said on both sides, but the want of co-operation or rather open hostility shewn to the police when they sent up a case for trial, in which a railway servant above the menial class was the culprit, was amazing. True or false, the railway staff would weld together and even go to the extent of engaging counsel and producing perjured evidence in court. He had seen even the menial staff down tools assisted by their subordinate officers when one of their fellow workmen had been arrested *flagrante delicto* and there was not the slightest shadow of doubt regarding his guilt. In one case a menial was caught stealing in the yard, and as a result the whole of the station staff, including the Carriage-man, the Station Master and the Assistant Station Master went out on strike.

Inspector Farrant stated that it was very difficult to obtain evidence in a case in which a railway employee was the accused. There were also difficulties in getting wagons put on the platform for check. There was always a certain amount of ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments.

Prosecuting Inspector, Khairat Nabi, stated that the railway staff were not always on good terms with the railway police, who had occasionally to prosecute them under the various enactments of the Law. It was his experience of some 12 years in the railway police, that 70 %, if not more, of the crime on the railway was committed by the railway staff themselves. He had known of several instances in which superior officers had taken the part of their subordinates and had displayed active opposition to the police.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shunker stated that there was want of co-operation between the two forces, the railway staff generally exhibiting apathy for work which concerned the railway police. As they were always afraid of the police, they never gave any assistance.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated that there was want of co-operation between the two forces. The trouble arose from the fact that in 80 % of cognizable cases, the railway staff, including menials and others, were always suspected either to have been in the know or to have connived at, or to have been the actual perpetrators, or to have sheltered the culprits. This state of affairs could easily be remedied if the station-house officer kept a thorough control over the staff and maintained social relations with them. He must be civil, polite and courteous.

Bombay.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General, was of opinion that co-operation largely depended upon the relations existing between the Superintendent of Police on the one hand and the heads of Railway Departments and the railway district officers on the other. Police work could not be satisfactorily discharged unless their relations were cordial and it was the primary duty of the Superintendent of Police to establish such relations. He regarded the unpopularity of a Superintendent with the Railway Department as a cogent reason for his transfer elsewhere. Friction between the subordinate ranks of the Railway Police and the Traffic Department was, in his opinion, inevitable.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that there was want of co-operation and some friction. The railway community naturally did not see eye to eye with the foreign element in their midst. They did not know the Law and were apt to expect the police to perform duties and services which they were not authorised to perform. It should not be understood that there was a general state of mutual hostility. Co-operation between the police and railway staff was essential in respect of reporting and enquiring into offences. There was a tendency on the part of the railway staff to report everything missing as stolen and a reluctance on the part of the railway police to register as theft what they suspected was on y lost. Presuming the Company or the members of the staff were liable to make good the cost of anything missing provided it had not been stolen, it could be understood that the natural inclination would be to establish thefts in as many cases as possible and to prevail upon the railway police to accept cases as thefts.

Example (A)—A Station Master reports that a wagon has arrived with a seal broken and a parcel short and asks the police to enquire or wires the despatching station to report if the parcel was correctly loaded. If the latter wires back in the affirmative he then reports to the

police. It is quite simple for the despatching station to wire that the parcel was loaded correctly to save themselves the trouble of looking for it. There were thousands of such cases and no good was obtained by the police accepting them.

Example (B).—A guard may see his train being robbed and make no report till he reaches his destination hours later. He then sends a brief telegram to the police who then have to wait till his return.

Example (C).—A station master may hear of an offence in the yard at night and not report till next day.

Example (D).—Station Master, Nandgaon, wires to Sub-Inspector, Igatpuri :—“ Guard of 279 reports seven wagons opened between Padli and Lahavit ” The guard could have wired immediately from the first stopping station or made a detailed report at Nasik where there is a police outpost. The nature of the goods stolen is not given.

It was essential that the railway staff should co-operate by giving the police prompt and full information. It would be a great advantage if the Railway Company appointed an officer to deal with this question. The best person would be the officer suggested to superintend the Watch and Ward. The Police Superintendent should address him direct in the matter of complaints and part of his duty would be to keep the staff up to the mark in this respect. On the other hand, he could bring to light neglect on the part of the Railway Police in taking action on complaints. There were far too many telegrams and too few reports. On the other hand it was argued that the police wasted valuable time in waiting for details instead of investigating at once. There was much to be said for such a point of view, but it had to be remembered that if the police accepted every cryptic telegram and memorandum they received they would be overwhelmed and would stand little chance of detecting any cases at all. The remedy lay in enforcing a sense of responsibility on the staff. There was a tremendous scope for fraud in the existing state of affairs. Drastic action in the most flagrant cases would gradually have a beneficial effect. The police would have more confidence if they knew that what might be classed as maliciously or intentionally false complaints met their just reward.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, was of opinion that on the whole relations were harmonious. There was bound to be some ill-feeling especially between Station Masters and Sub-Inspectors.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that there was want of co-operation, but one side was not more to blame than the other.

Sub-Inspector Rege stated that ticket collectors and guards worried railway police constables if found without ticket or pass or if found travelling in servants' compartments even when satisfied that the man was a railway policeman.

Inspector Garside on special duty as Watch and Ward Inspector on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway was of opinion that friction was inevitable. If the police wanted to run in a pointsman, the station master would shield him as he was a good pointsman.

Mr. Lallubhai Hargovindas, Public Prosecutor, Odhwa, (Panch Mahals), was also of opinion that friction was inevitable.

Madras.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General, was of opinion that there was want of co-operation between the railway staff and the railway police. The railways did not ask for the help of the police in putting down malpractices. Inspectors and sub-inspectors did not make efforts to know members of the railway staff. Station masters did not like the railway police.

Mr. Hanyngton, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, stated that there was want of co-operation amounting to general mistrust of one another. As far as possible gazetted officers tried to prevent this state of affairs which might be due to the fact that the police tried to prevent pilferages.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, stated that the co-operation between the railway staff and the railway police was not as satisfactory as it ought to be, especially as far as the lower grades were concerned and the reason was obvious when the answer to question 7 was considered. Speaking generally there was no pronounced ill-feeling between the two departments. Every effort was made to foster co-operation and good will by the grant of rewards. Railway men would not give evidence against each other.

Inspector Doraiswamy was of opinion that, as regards co-operation, there was not much to complain of and there was no ill-feeling worth mentioning.

Bengal.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, stated that there was much lack of co-operation where the subordinates were concerned and when it affected their interests, active opposition. He cited as an instance a recent circular issued by the Station Superintendent, Howrah, running as follows :—“ Whenever a case of opium smuggling is detected

it must not be handed to the Government Railway Police. All such cases must be brought to my immediate notice for any action that I may deem necessary. Please treat this as most urgent". The effect of this order was to shut out the subordinates at Howrah Station from giving any information to the police. There was no ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, was of opinion that there was no want of co-operation generally and no ill-feeling.

Inspector D. N. Mukharji stated that so far as the superior officers were concerned there was not much trouble. Regarding subordinate officers, difficulties arose when personal interests were affected. Some subordinates possessed an exaggerated idea of their own importance and became active obstructionists if the police did anything affecting their staff without consulting them. Members of the railway staff when they had to report anything to the police submitted incomplete reports.

Inspector S. C. Banarji was of opinion that there was want of co-operation and also that ill-feeling existed. Members of the railway staff who were concerned in thefts or had indirect knowledge naturally did not co-operate.

Assam.

The Assam Government was of opinion that there was want of co-operation and at times friction.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, mentioned that there was friction unavoidable in many cases owing to divergence of ends and views, *e.g.*, protection of public or Government interests *versus* protection of Railway interests. The principal cause of friction was mere jealousy. The railway authorities resented their servants being summoned before the police, or they disliked the powers of the police, namely, arrest, search, etc., which were not possessed by their own subordinates to an equal degree. The railway were inclined to expect the police to take up non-cognizable cases but were quite reasonable in the matter of missing goods cases.

Inspector Syed Hashmatullah mentioned that in many cases railway officers supported their subordinates and scarcely rendered any help to the police.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that there was great want of co-operation between the members of the railway staff and the railway police. If any railway subordinate were arrested in connection with a case, friction always ensued till the conclusion thereof. He stated that it was a fact that recently at Mokameh Ghat, the Police had to close down the investigation of a case because they could not get the Traffic Inspector to come down to arrange for open delivery of goods so that they might find what property had actually been stolen. He would not go so far as to say that there had been hundreds of such cases, but he thought that there had been several. He had recently passed orders to the effect that if there were delay in taking over delivery, the investigation should be closed and the final report should be submitted later. He instanced a case which occurred a few months ago in which a sack had been stolen, but the police were unable to find out until the expiration of several months whether it had contained grain or salt. In the meantime, they could make no enquiry.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that there was a want of co-operation which was due in part to the fact that the police were required to consider the interests of the travelling public. There was direct antagonism on the part of the railway staff towards the members of the railway police. Khargpur yard, for instance, was a very big yard and a very large number of people were employed there. There were several cases of lack of co-operation during the last Yard Master's term of office. The position became so bad that he had eventually to apply for his transfer. He used to dismiss menials of the railway staff who gave information to the police when they saw people committing thefts. His objection was that the information should be first conveyed to the Yard Master, and through him to the police. The police objected to that arrangement. The Yard Master contended that the men had no right to give information of what had occurred except through him, and his District Traffic Superintendent supported his contention. He pointed out that if this procedure were adopted, the police would only get those cases where the accused had not been in a position sufficiently to pay the Yard Master. Eventually he went to the Traffic Manager who accepted his point of view and transferred the man. He would like to keep the Railway Police even more separate than they were from the Railways who looked at things purely from the point of view of commercial morality. He cited a recent case where a motor was run over by an engine and the police could not get information out of the Agent's Office on the ground that the case was likely to result in litigation. He would have cases under Sections 126 to 130 of the Railway Act made over to the District Police.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, stated that sometimes there was friction between the railway and police subordinates, and in the majority of cases though the railway subordinates were at fault, still they were supported by their officers. For instance if a constable caught a railway servant in the act of thieving, the station master would take the part of that man, and say that the charge was fabricated. If the police pressed the charge, then there would be reports to the District Traffic Superintendent, who would, in turn, write to the Superintendent of Police and a good deal of trouble would arise. He cited a case where the station master refused to believe that members of the Watch and Ward had been caught sleeping until their *pagris* and lamps were produced. The police had to await the convenience of railway officers in getting information. About 1910-11, an order was issued to the effect that the police could not examine any member of the Loco Staff direct but only in the presence of the Loco officer. The orders at first referred to accidents, but were gradually extended to all kinds of enquiries and were still in force. Railway cases were sometimes reported after the expiry of 3 or 4 months. The real trouble was that the railway staff did not check wagons immediately. Supposing a wagon was loaded at Howrah, and booked for Peshawar, and the seal was found broken at Jhajha it would be immediately re-sealed and sent on to destination. Nobody would be informed about it until it was taken up to Peshawar. The intermediate people would evade responsibility.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that there was a considerable amount of friction due to faults on both sides. Railway officials frequently expected and demanded too much, while police officers were not sufficiently obliging. The duties of the police were such that the interests they served were very often opposed to those of the railway company. "To put it bluntly, one was a thief and the other was a thief catcher, and there could not be much amity between the two." The railway administrations felt that they paid a large sum toward the upkeep of the railway police, and expected that their reasonable or unreasonable requests should necessarily be complied with. The railway police, however, knew that they were Government servants and were under no obligation to the railway.

Inspector Fauzdar Narain Kuar, Gaya, stated that he was aware of the ill-feeling between the railway police and the railway staff. The railway staff did not lend help to the police investigation. He cited a case in which a fireman was arrested with some stolen property, some *thans* of markin, while he was going to dispose of the property. When brought to the thana, he made a confession and said that the property was concealed somewhere under ashes. He then mentioned certain persons who were concerned in the affair. The sub-inspector went to search the houses of some firemen. In order to do so the permission of the Locomotive Foreman was necessary. When permission was asked to search the houses of his men, he said that he was not going to take any responsibility, and that the men might strike if the police searched their houses. The Railway Police were not so independent as the District Police, but had to consider the interests of the Company; consequently, the results were not good.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, thought that there was want of co-operation but no ill-feeling.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, said that the railway subordinate staff were in many places hostile to the railway police and their work. He had known of instances where railway officers had requested the police to release their men for the simple reason that they feared a strike.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent, stated that the co-operation was not sufficient. Ill-feeling was only noticed at enquiries where railway employees were involved.

Inspector Glackan stated that there was want of co-operation which was not due to ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments, but to the fact that railway subordinates shielded each other. This fact had a great deal to do with the difficulties experienced in the detection of thefts from yards and goods sheds. Station masters would not like the railway police to talk to them about pilferage or the state of crime.

Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan agreed that there was want of co-operation, but no ill-feeling. Railway officials tried to avoid the police as much as possible.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi stated that co-operation between the railway staff and the railway police was nominal and at times the railway staff instead of rendering assistance created obstacles in the way of investigations. For instance, if a railway employee were arrested the staff would tutor witnesses and coerce them into not appearing in Court. They would collect money and engage pleaders for the defence. False defence witnesses would be produced in Court. Improvement in the relations between the two forces depended upon the personality of the men. The only way in which it was possible to secure co-operation was by making the railway officials hold some responsibility. The Watch and Ward system should be under the Railway, but the Police should have control. They should be paid by the Railway and supervised by the Police. If the station master and other station officials were determined to prevent crime then only would there be co-operation.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula stated that there was want of co-operation, but no ill-feeling.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that there was not a great deal to complain of, but there was no getting away from the fact that some officers did not care to see the police about. The subordinates and clerks, not the menials, disliked the police; they regarded them as spies on their movements and realized that their presence hampered their malpractices, the result was that they did not hesitate to make frivolous and exaggerated reports to their immediate superiors who in some instances, were only too ready to believe anything bad of the police. The railway subordinates did not assist the police. They tried to put obstacles in the way of convicting a man even when there was a clear case (*vide* extract from judgment of First Class Magistrate for Railways, Hyderabad).

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that friction must always exist where dishonest subordinates had to work together. This friction however was only general amongst the lower ranks.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that there was want of co-operation and ill-feeling. The railway staff regarded the railway police as interlopers who were there merely to harass them. He suggested that responsibility should be placed on the railway departments. Where a man committed a crime the department to which he belonged should be held responsible. At present when a man was caught removing some stuff from a wagon and was sent up, complaints against the police would be lodged when they went out on patrol the next night and the police would be informed that there would be a strike unless they kept away. Cases of that nature had occurred at Karachi. The railway staff also displayed a lack of interest in cases and even refused to allow their staff to appear as witnesses. They also refused to give up their men as accused.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that there was want of co-operation and agreed that co-operation between the higher officers of the Traffic Department and the Police was necessary. Co-operation between the constables and the menial staff was not desirable as their union resulted in the commission of thefts. He knew of many instances of ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that the co-operation between the superior officers of both departments was satisfactory so far as the North-Western Railway was concerned. There was, however, a tendency in some company lines to look askance at the railway police and in this respect he instanced the case of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway which refused to grant leave passes either to officers or men of the railway police. This invidious distinction gave rise to resentment. So far as the subordinate ranks were concerned there was little, if any, co-operation but he had not come across any instances of actual hostility.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that the relations between the railway staff and the railway police were satisfactory. There were standing orders from the Inspector-General that the Sub-Divisional Officers and their subordinates should see the District Traffic Superintendent at least once every two months. He had found it difficult to secure the co-operation of the railway. He instanced the case of a loss from a cash chest which arrived from Bannu. The sub-inspector registered the case and started the investigation. He went to the Deputy Traffic Superintendent, who, however, would not immediately relieve the men required by the sub-inspector. When they were relieved, one of the clerks wired to him to say that he had been tortured by the sub-inspector. Fortunately, the Assistant Inspector-General was encamped at his headquarters at the time. He heard the case and found that it was a false complaint. Otherwise, had he not been there, the sub-inspector would probably have been put to trouble. He had known several instances in which he had asked for men whom he suspected to be relieved of their duties at once, but the railway authorities had taken days to effect their relief.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that on the surface there appeared to be no friction, but as a matter of fact, there was very little co-operation.

North-West Frontier Province.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, stated that there was very little friction as it was rigorously suppressed.

Khan Sahib Rama Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that, generally speaking, there was no want of co-operation except in instances when members of the railway staff were themselves guilty or suspected. At times instances had come to notice and there was an undercurrent of mistrust in the minds of subordinates of both departments which often found vent in the shape of frivolous or silly complaints that could always be set right, or at least mitigated by cordial relations between gazetted officers.

Question No. 28.—Is any more effective system of liaison possible, e.g., by deputing railway officers to the Railway Police and police officers to the Railway temporarily or by employing police officers permanently in the Claims Branch?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, did not think that the suggestion would do any good.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, thought that the suggestion might be given a trial. He was not prepared to give any opinion on the question of deputation of police officers to the Claims Branch as it was too technical a subject.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, did not think very much good would result from the proposed deputation.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, thought that if a Divisional Inspector could be attached to a Traffic Inspector to watch his methods, or if a Sub-Inspector could act as an assistant goods clerk for a short time it might result in his acquiring a knowledge useful in his investigating work. There was no necessity for such deputation in the case of gazetted officers but they ought to have some preliminary training. It would be an advantage if all Assistant Superintendents of Police were attached to a Railway Police Section for a short time while under training.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, was of opinion that the suggestion was an excellent one and should lead to good results provided that the underlying principle involved, *viz.*, helpful co-operation and constructive criticism was not lost sight of. Mere destructive criticism would only lead to friction and would yield no results. Experienced police officers would be of great assistance in the Claims Branch and the Divisional Traffic Manager's office in enquiring into, and advising on the adjudication of, claims cases.

Inspector Farrant was of opinion that Railway Police officers should be deputed to the Railway temporarily to learn Railway work, and that Railway Police officers should be employed in the Claims Branch.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi thought that the suggestions were good and believed that retired police officers would make excellent Claims Inspectors.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shanker thought that a temporary deputation of Railway Police officers to the Claims Branch would tend to create better co-operation between the Railway and the Police and would give the latter officers an intimate knowledge of the working of the railway.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz entertained the opinion that the suggestions would not achieve any good result.

Bombay.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, did not think that any advantage would result from the proposed deputation. If a separate railway officer were appointed as Superintendent of the Watch and Ward Staff he might prove a useful *liaison* officer. Part of his duty would be to enquire into missing goods consignments and enforce a sense of responsibility on the staff. He would be in close touch with the Superintendent, Railway Police, and would refer cases of negligence to him.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, did not think that any advantage would be derived from the proposed deputation.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, thought that the suggestions might be given a trial. An experienced Traffic officer might be appointed as Superintendent of the Watch and Ward. He might enquire into missing goods cases and report the result to the Superintendent of Railway Police.

Sub-Inspector Rege was of opinion that a police officer working on a railway could become acquainted with the working thereof in six months. Police officers might be deputed temporarily to the Claims Section.

Madras.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General, did not think that the proposed deputation would do any good. With reference to the suggestion that Railway Police officers did not understand the Railway system he did not think that that was the case with the Railway Police in Madras.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General of the Criminal Investigation Department, was of opinion that any such scheme would be impossible. He had no objection to a mutual deputation if it was merely regarded as a species of training, but a man who had done a life's work in the police would not be a success as a railway official and *vice versa*.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, did not think that the mutual exchange of officers would be of much practical advantage, but the deputation of an Inspector to the Claims Branch would doubtless be of value to the Railway Company.

Inspector Doraiswamy was not in favour of the suggestion.

Bengal.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General of Police, did not think that any effective system of *liaison* was possible.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, did not think that the suggestion was very practicable, but it might be a good thing for an Assistant Superintendent of Police before he was put in charge of a railway district to be sent to the Traffic Department to learn something about the running of trains, etc.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, thought that no useful purpose would be served by interchanging even temporarily.

Inspector D. N. Mukerjee thought the suggestion impracticable as the technical knowledge required in either department would be a bar.

Inspector S. C. Banerjee thought that a police officer might be employed to great advantage in the Claims Branch of the railways.

Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, was of opinion, and the *Assam Government* agreed with him, that there would be no benefit in deputing Railway officers to the Railway Police, but police officers and men could be usefully deputed for a fixed period to work in departments of the Railway in which their knowledge was deficient.

Inspector Syed Hashmatullah said that it would be an advantage if police officers were temporarily deputed to the Railway—especially in the transshipment and similar branches.

Inspector U. C. Deb thought that the deputation of police officers to the Claims Branch would be very effective.

Bihar and Orissa.

The *Bihar and Orissa Government* was of opinion that the temporary deputation of Railway Police officers to the Railway Department to gain technical experience in matters of railway administration and working would be excellent. The permanent employment of trained police officers in the Claims Branch would also be beneficial, both to the Force and to the Railway. On the other hand, it was difficult to see what advantage would be gained by the temporary deputation of Railway officers to the Railway Police, and the idea seemed neither feasible nor desirable.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, was of opinion that it would be an excellent plan if sub-inspectors could be deputed for a few months to important railway stations to learn traffic working. They should spend a few weeks in (a) checking clerk's office, (b) booking office, (c) goods clerk's office. He did not think that any good would result from the permanent employment of police officers in the Claims Branch.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Kharagpur, was strongly opposed to all the suggestions. He did not think that sub-inspectors of the Railway Police who had been in charge for five years had much to learn about the railway system. If he were deputed in the first instance, he would pick up many other things too, and there would be difficulty in maintaining morale amongst the Railway Police. He would like the two forces even more separate than they were at present.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, did not think that any more effective system of *liaison* was possible. He cited a case in which a constable at Dinapur was sent privately to work as a Loco. employee. The fact leaked out, and shortly after, the constable was charged with theft of some cotton waste. A guard was employed on brake van thefts, but he also failed to give satisfaction. He was afraid that police officers would not be so useful as Traffic Inspectors in settling up matters with merchants in the Claims Branch. There were however constant complaints of delays in receiving reports on both sides, and if a set of police officers were employed in the Claims Branch, work might be facilitated to some extent.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that the deputation of Railway Police officers to railways even temporarily except for the purpose of giving them training would be out of the question. The ideal arrangement would be to have Police Inspectors qualified in Civil Law in the Claims Branch. The present class of Claims Inspector had little or no knowledge of Civil and Criminal law and had very little experience of investigating intricate claims cases. Consequently they had to depend largely on the Goods Clerks and Station Masters. Cases of fraud perpetrated on the railway by submission of false *bejaks* were seldom detected and even when reported were received so late and so incomplete that the offenders could not be brought to book. Police officers well-versed in Criminal Law and investigation work should be employed in the office of each District Traffic Superintendent and the Traffic Manager to give

him advice regarding claims cases. The railways would gain materially by giving effect to such a system. He personally knew of one or two instances in which an *ex-Railway* Police Inspector who was employed as Claims or Traffic Inspector had given satisfaction. Railway Police officers should receive training in claims cases. Their duties often demanded a knowledge of such work.

Inspector Fauzdar Narain Kuar suggested that police officers might be deputed to learn traffic working, but was opposed to railway officers being deputed to the police.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, considered the suggestion an impossible one.

Mr. Ilurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, stated that the only possible means he could suggest for bringing about a more effective system of *liaison* was that more responsibility should be placed on railway district officers for crime in connection with goods, etc., within their districts. At present beyond asking for a police report railway officers did not appear to interest themselves in matters affecting the safety of goods, etc., at stations. The system of taking goods at owner's risk had a great deal to do with this attitude. The temporary deputation of Traffic officers to the Railway Police would give such officers an insight into the difficulties experienced by the Police and might improve matters. The appointment of Police officers to the Claims Branch would be useful and would promote a better spirit between the two services.

Messrs. Mayberry, Glackan and Baijnath Kaula doubted whether the suggestion contained in the question would be of any practical use.

Inspector Sharif Mahammad Khan stated that it was necessary for the investigating staff to know the duties and rules of the railway. A few months' training in the Audit, Traffic and Claims Branches was necessary.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, mentioned in his written reply to the questionnaire that he did not think anything was to be gained by this arrangement, but questioned by the Committee admitted that Railway Police officers would be very much better for a knowledge of traffic working and line clear system, etc., in accident cases. In missing goods cases they would also be able to know to what books to refer and what checks were supplied by the railway which would help to localize theft. The officers, however, must be sent for six months' study. The detective experience of a Railway Police Inspector would be of value to the Claims Department. In fact the police often helped the Nizam's Guaranteed State Railway in their cases.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, did not think that any more effective system of *liaison* was possible.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, did not think any more effective system of *liaison* was possible but considered that an able Traffic Inspector should be placed under the Superintendent of Railway Police.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali thought that some more effective system was possible but made no suggestions.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, thought that it was most necessary that the subordinate officers of the Railway Claims Department should receive training in police procedure and law, such as was provided in the training school for probationary Sub-Inspectors of Police and a further course in the prosecuting office of the Railway Police. Such files of the Claims Department as he had seen disclosed extremely sketchy and loosely conducted enquiries, the enquiry officers obviously having had no training in systematic methods of searching for evidence or making logical deductions from facts. Similarly he would like to see probationary Sub-Inspectors of Police receive training as guards, loading, unloading and tally clerks. It would also be to the advantage of the Claims Department to include a few officers (Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors) in its establishment. It was most necessary that subordinate officers of the Claims Department should be trained in police work, so that the knowledge might be useful to them in the investigation of cases.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that mutual transfers from among the upper subordinate ranks of the Railway Police to the Claims Branch might prove effective. Claims Inspectors would only prove useful when they had gone through the training given to the police in law and procedure.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that it was necessary that Railway Police officers generally should be acquainted with railway work and a certain number of Inspectors and

Sub-Inspectors should be placed permanently in the Claims Branch. Claims Inspectors should also be familiar with the procedure of investigation held by the Railway Police.

North-West Frontier Province.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, was not in favour of any of the suggestions.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that the training of police officers and subordinates in the work of the Traffic Department by temporarily deputing them there would be productive of much good. It would give them an insight into the methods of work and thereby help their investigation of "internal" crime. The deputation of Traffic officers to the Railway Police and Police officers to the Claims Branch would not be of much use.

Question No. 29.—What are the principal difficulties encountered in railway police investigations? What have you to suggest for their removal? In particular, have you reason to complain of (1) delay in reporting, (2) difficulties due to reference to other jurisdictions (e.g., district police or railway police of another division or province) or to railway authorities?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, mentioned that the principal difficulty was that when a sub-inspector started to enquire into a case it was almost certain that in 9 out of 10 cases the crime was the work of district criminals. The investigation of such crimes could be more profitably conducted by the District than by the Railway Police subject to the qualification that investigation of offences under the Railway Act and cases in which the accused were arrested red-handed or within railway limits should be enquired into by the Railway Police. In other enquiries they could also help the District Police greatly owing to their knowledge of the personal relations between the various members of the railway staff and their connection with other railway officials. He would insist on laying more stress on the responsibility of the District Police than on that of the Railway Police as regards cases of theft or offences against property when the accused were not arrested red-handed.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, mentioned that the principal difficulty was in the location of crime.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, stated that in Railway Police investigations there was a very much smaller percentage of successful cases than in the District Police and in railway goods thefts convictions were practically nil, the main difficulties being identification of property and references to other jurisdictions. Another difficulty was due to the fact that there were different rules in the various provinces. More action under Section 110, Criminal Procedure Code, was wanted.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that the main difficulties were localisation, identification and delay in reporting. There were also difficulties due to want of information about bad characters.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, stated that there was considerable delay in reporting cases. A big percentage of the stolen property was generally unidentifiable and 90 % of the thefts were the work of the railway staff. There was also great delay in getting replies from other jurisdictions. One officer carried the investigation on until he was able to prove that the case occurred in another jurisdiction when it was transferred to that jurisdiction. Other jurisdictions at times refused to take over cases. They would not touch shortages from seal-intact wagons and when the papers were forwarded no reply was received and the case had to be filed.

Inspector Macleod mentioned that localization was the greatest difficulty. Officers seldom went beyond the boundaries of their divisions.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that the difficulties met with were numerous and serious. He tabulated them under three heads:—

1. Against the Railway Administration—

- (a) Belated reports. (*Inspector Farrant and Sub-Inspectors Abdul Aziz and Pearey Shanker* agreed.)
- (b) Insufficient information.
- (c) Description and value of the property stolen were not known or stated. (*Inspector Farrant and Sub-Inspector Pearey Shanker* agreed.)
- (d) Unidentifiable nature of the property stolen, the Railway not marking all consignments. (*Inspector Farrant and Sub-Inspector Pearey Shanker* agreed. The latter stated that each package or bag of a consignment should bear railway marks as well as the name of the starting or despatching station. At present only a few packages out of several in a consignment were marked.)

- (e) Delay in checking contents of wagons found with seals broken.
- (f) Faulty seal checking, and the omission of guards to make over Form T.-0887 to the Railway Police promptly and the giving of incorrect information in such reports.
- (g) Failure to locate the occurrence. (*Inspector Farrant and Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz* agreed.)
- (h) Reluctance on the part of the railway staff to give evidence more especially when their fellow-employees were implicated. (*Inspector Farrant* agreed.)
- (i) Difficulties over jurisdiction.

The above omissions occurred daily, and though brought to notice repeatedly, were allowed to continue with indifference. They constituted a serious drawback to the successful detection and prevention of crime on the Railway.

2. *Against the District Police.*—Failure, due either to apathy or dishonest motives, to realize their responsibilities in the matter of railway thefts. Such cases, if located, were registered by the District Police without a number. This localization was a most difficult matter and in many cases, even if satisfactorily located, proof of this was disputed, with the result that little or no help was rendered in bringing culprits to book. The rules called for revision as the District Police were loath to give attention and did not invariably give the willing co-operation that was essential in this important class of crime. Both branches of the force should maintain a register for running goods train thefts, which should be open for inspection by either party and it should be frequently examined by inspecting officers. All crime located by the Railway Police should find entry in this register. (*Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz* added that the thieves lived beyond the Railway Police jurisdiction.)

3. *Against the Railway Police of other divisions or provinces.*—Here again, the rules were defective and registration was often seriously delayed. Some Railway Police Administrations were a law unto themselves and rigidly refused to accept cases reported to them or sent to them for acceptance after due investigation had been made and the venue of the occurrence reasonably proved to have occurred in that jurisdiction. The rules laid down in paragraph 7, Appendix VI, Government Railway Police Manual, United Provinces, though reasonable enough, were not carried out in their entirety and he would, to ensure prompt registration and investigation, make absolute the rule that all reports should be registered and investigated at the police station where the report was made. Further investigation and the transfer of the case, if necessary, could be made at a later stage. Continuity of investigation was another stumbling block and for this reason he advocated that the Railway Police should be welded into a universal All-India force as was the case in the Railway Mail Service. Finally, cases were often delayed owing to the railway authorities failing to reply to references made to them and this applied equally to the other sections and provinces where the Government Railway Police were themselves concerned.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi stated that there were many difficulties which the Railway Police had to encounter in the prevention and detection of crime. The railway staff were loath to give substantial assistance and the District Police, in whose jurisdiction the major portion of the stolen property was disposed of, were not always willing to co-operate with the Railway Police. Severe punishments for those refusing to co-operate would serve the purpose. Railway Police sub-inspectors had not been provided with any conveyance allowance although they often had to visit villages in the District Police jurisdiction in connection with investigation of cases, etc., which caused them either to curtail their proceedings or make false entries in the diaries to the direct prejudice of the aims and objects of the enquiry. *Sub-Inspector Pearey Shanker* agreed that a conveyance allowance should be given.

Sub-Inspectors Abdul Aziz and Pearey Shanker stated that delays in reporting and the location of places of occurrence could be removed if the seals of wagons were checked at every station.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz advocated that intelligent and literate men should be posted to the Railway Police, and the local police should receive strict instructions to watch their bad characters and to take action against them under the preventive sections.

Bombay.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General, thought that localization of thefts was the main difficulty. References to other provinces was a minor difficulty though sometimes there was difficulty in getting a man out of a Native State especially in Guzerat.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, was of opinion that location of offences was the principal difficulty. There was also delay and overhaste in reporting. Difficulties due to references to other jurisdictions were not great. He gave a concrete case of the last named difficulty referring to a cash-chest which was rifled on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway between Poona and Madras. The chest arrived intact at Madras but on being opened the

contents were found missing. In this case the Madras Police transferred the investigation to the Bombay Police who in turn sent it on to the Bangalore Police. All three jurisdictions made enquiries. The case was subsequently referred to the Inspector-General.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, said that the main difficulties were that (1) the location and (2) the nature of the property stolen were unknown. Regarding (1) all that could be done was to depute patrols with goods trains at night. A number of trains were not escorted and in these cases the Railway Police had to rely on the railway entirely for location. When it was established with some degree of certainty that a theft must have occurred between two particular stations the Railway Police had to rely on the co-operation of the District Police in finding out what bad characters there were in the neighbourhood and in searching their houses. If that produced no result nothing could be done except to rely on the information of outsiders and informers. Running train thefts were principally the work of different gangs on the line and the Railway Police endeavoured to obtain particulars through informers.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that the main difficulty lay in locating offences committed in passenger and goods trains due to the lack of proper information supplied by the Railway Company. He suggested stricter disciplinary measures by the Railway Company in the case of those employees who offended in this respect. There was a certain amount of delay in reporting certain cases. Cases should be registered where reported. Enquiries should be made independent of jurisdictions.

Sub-Inspector Rege thought that localization was the main difficulty. In the case of thefts on passenger trains the passenger concerned could not give definite information as to where the theft took place. The theft generally occurred at night and was only detected in the morning. Identification of property, especially grain, was another stumbling block. There were also occasional delays in reporting. Railway Authorities did not supply the information required either promptly or in sufficient detail.

Mr. Lallubhai Hargobindas, Public Prosecutor, Godhra (Panch Mahals), suggested that the principal difficulty was the lack of co-operation between the Railway Police and the District Police.

Madras.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, thought that localization was one of the chief difficulties even with the careful system of seal checking in force in the presidency. Results depended on the personal equation. Delays in reporting were not frequent. There were sometimes difficulties due to references to other jurisdictions.

Inspector Doraiswamy said that the two difficulties were: (1) localization, (2) quick movements of criminals and property. There was no delay in reporting cases and only occasional instances of difficulty due to references to other jurisdictions.

Bengal.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, stated that the greatest hindrance to police investigation was—(1) Difficulty in locating crime. In 50 % or more of cases the officer did not know where to begin the real investigation. Then came (2) delay in reporting; (3) failure to report nature of property stolen; (4) unreliability of the railway employees; (5) the criminal propensities of the low paid staff; (6) difficulty in taking preventive measures; (7) slack surveillance over railway thieves; (8) interference of railway subordinates; (9) reluctance on the part of the Railway Company to introduce reforms and carry out suggestions.

He made the following suggestions for the removal of these difficulties:—(1) Provide an efficient seal-checking staff; (2) the Railway Company must insist on reporting by the officials concerned; (3) if the Railway Company wished it the owners of property could be quickly found and the nature of the property stolen ascertained from them. This should be done. (4) No remedy. (5) With better organization this should greatly improve. (6) Provide a reserve for the purpose. (7) District Police officers might be directed to tighten up surveillance but much improvement could not in the nature of things be expected. (8) The management should take serious notice when satisfied that the subordinate was obstructing police investigation. (9) Such reluctance should be overcome.

Mr. Ezekiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, stated that the principal difficulties were (1) localizing the crime, (2) tracing stolen property as it could be quickly carried away and disposed of easily even before reports were received, (3) tracing thieves who seldom left any clue, (4) obtaining evidence. As regards missing goods that had been stolen there was always considerable delay in getting the list of articles stolen and as a rule articles were of an unidentifiable nature. He could see no way of removing these difficulties.

Inspector S. C. Banerjee said that:—(a) The jurisdiction of the Railway Police was limited to railway limits and the Railway Police had no local knowledge of and influence in the District Police jurisdiction where usually the enquiries had to be directed. (b) Co-operation

of the District Police was not effective. (c) Enquiries purely connected with the railway had to be extended far beyond the jurisdiction of the *thana* and could not be easily followed up. (d) Journeys and halts on the railway were very tedious and expensive. (e) For enquiry into the interior cycles were required, but it was difficult to maintain cycles without an allowance.

Inspector D. N. Mukharji enumerated the following difficulties: (1) delay in reporting, (2) inability of the railway to furnish necessary information, (3) unreliability of guards, etc., as to seal-checking, (4) delay in securing the parties to things stolen, (5) inability of the Railway Police to adopt preventive measures or to supervise bad characters outside their jurisdiction, (6) unnecessary interference of railway subordinates.

Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, mentioned that the principal difficulties felt by the Railway Police in their investigations were:—(1) cases against the railway staff were rarely promptly reported to the police; (2) loss or theft of consignments of unidentifiable property were often reported long after the occurrence rendering the chances of detection small; (3) delay in transmission of railway messages to the police. These were held up as the railway staff did not want the police to get to know until too late. He also mentioned the difficulty of following up registered letter thefts for which there was no staff available; (4) difficulty in getting hold of witnesses or securing their attendance. Going long distances to examine them. Their apathy in many cases and unwillingness either to stay at the places where the thefts occurred to explain the details to the Police, or to come back again or to take any interest in the result of their cases.

Although in law Railway Police Sub-Inspecters had the full powers of an officer in charge when in any village yet in practice their power and influence was negligible unless they were accompanied by local police officers, and they could get little information or assistance, when alone, from village headmen, chowkidars or private gentlemen.

Inspector Syed Hashmatullah agreed with Mr. Giles' remarks.

Inspector U. C. Deb mentioned the following difficulties:—(1) disappearance of the parties from the spot; (2) localization; (3) prompt help from the local police was not obtainable.

He thought this last point could be remedied if the same police officer made enquiries from start to finish of a case.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that the principal difficulties encountered in Railway Police investigations were:—(i) The absence of a guidance from a seal-deficient wagon. This meant that the police did not know the nature of the property stolen for weeks and even months after the case had been reported which might be obviated by fitting a small box outside each wagon to hold the guidance. The box could be opened and locked by an ordinary railway key. (ii) Want of description of the property stolen or missing, which could be obviated if a note giving these details was made in the guidance. (iii) Delay in checking contents of wagons found seal-deficient, which could be overcome if the orders published in the East Indian Railway Gazette, dated the 8th September 1920 were carried out. (iv) Delay in effecting open delivery:—At present open delivery could not be given except under orders of the Divisional Traffic Manager, which caused unnecessary delay. It would save considerable time if station masters were empowered to grant open deliveries in the presence of the Railway Police sub-inspector. (v) Delay in the receipt of the guard's report in form T-337. It would facilitate work greatly if Guards were asked to hand over to the Government Railway Police immediately on arrival a copy of their train report.

There were also great difficulties due to references to railway authorities, which often caused very great delay and rendered detection difficult.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that the majority of thefts were committed by railway menials and their immediate superiors protected them. He had reason to complain of delays in reporting and difficulties due to references to other jurisdictions. Frequently, investigations had to be closed before a reply was received from one or all of the three causes. It was very difficult to suggest a remedy. The reason was that the railways looked upon everything from one standpoint only, namely, that of commercial morality. When the police took up a case and wanted information, it went through a series of officers. They wanted to be quite sure that the reply they were going to give would not prejudice them in the sight of the claimant if a civil suit was filed. That was one of the chief causes of the delay. There was an accident case a few months ago in which a motor-car was knocked over by an engine, and certain information was wanted by the Railway Police from the Agent's office, which was refused point blank on the ground that the case was likely to result in a big claim by the owner of the motor-car, and until the suit was disposed of they could not give any information.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, stated that police officers could not freely examine the railway staff, nor could they obtain information whenever required. In fact the police had to wait for the convenience of the railway servants who gave a number of excuses to put off matters. He knew some time ago there was a loco. order that the police could not examine the loco. staff direct but only in the presence of some loco. officer. As regards (1), there were

great delays in reporting cases; for instance, his index of crime showed 29 cases in the first quarter of 1920 reported at Dinapore, Dhanbad, Madhupur and Jhajha after a delay of one month and over and 24 cases in the last quarter of 1919. The property stolen in these cases being unidentifiable grain, etc., all chances of detection had disappeared before they were actually reported to the police. As regards (2), there were considerable delays in receiving replies from the railway officials particularly in communicating to the police the list of stolen property or in sending them the guards' reports and statements. Delay in submitting 'final' reports of cases made Magistrates and Commissioners pass unfavourable remarks at their inspections and the police had therefore issued general orders to station officers to submit 'final' within a week without waiting for references. In some cases delays were certainly unavoidable but if the railway authorities impressed upon their subordinates that the police were also part and parcel of the railway and severely punished infringement of orders, there might be some improvement.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that the principal difficulties were :—(a) Delay in reporting cases by the railway authorities, which often ranged from a fortnight to a year. The chief remedy would be that the railway administration should employ a better investigating agency than at present, i.e., the Traffic Inspectors should be more expeditious. Prompt checking of wagons with defective seals where the defect was noticed was required instead of resealing the wagon and allowing it to reach its destination. A change in the rules was required. (b) Absence of power to search houses in the jurisdiction of the local police though very close to the railway, but outside the Railway Police jurisdiction. The search had to be postponed till the officer in charge of the District Police came. In 95% of cases the local police sub-inspector could not, or did not come, and sent only a constable or a chowkidar as his representative. The officer in charge of a railway police station should be given the powers of search in all district police station limits through which his section of the railway ran. (c) Departmental circulars prohibiting Railway Police officers from leaving their jurisdiction without the permission of their Superintendent. Railway Police officers whose movements caused so little expense to the State owing to the pass provided for them should have the fullest freedom to track criminals or continue enquiries in other jurisdictions. (d) The general apathy and indifference of the railway staff towards the railway police for which there was hardly any remedy. (e) The absence of any quick means provided at a police station by which the investigating officer could reach the spot without waiting for a train. At important stations, if not at all police stations, the railway should provide a trolley for the use of the sub-inspector who could then reach the spot much quicker. The provision of a trolley and trolley-men for the sub-inspector would enable him to pay surprise visits to different stations and see things for himself. (f) The absence of any effective seal checking arrangement by the railway or the Railway Police at provincial borders and other suitable centres made localization of crime difficult and consequently hampered investigation. (g) The lack of any system of giving special training to railway police officers in the different branches of the railway. Such a training was essential for efficient investigation. He had found that as soon as an intricate case was reported the sub-inspector first learnt what the system of working was and then tried to investigate, expecting to find the defects of the system or to spot the loophole after a rudimentary and unsatisfactory training by probably an interested railway servant. (h) The present rules governing the registration of missing goods cases in the United Provinces, Bihar and Bengal were satisfactory, except in the case of the amendment suggested by him in question. There was some correspondence regarding questions of jurisdiction which was inevitable.

Inspector Fauzdar Narain Kuar stated that :—(a) Cases were not reported in time. (b) Complainants and witnesses belonged to distant places and did not like to break their journeys and thus be detained. (c) There were difficulties and delays in obtaining particulars from the Claims offices and other provinces. (d) Enquiries had to be made at various distant places, and the Railway Police could not possibly go in all the cases on account of insufficient staff.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that the main difficulties were (1) locating crime, (2) lack of co-operation on the part of the railway staff, (3) indifferent attitude of the complainants and unidentifiable nature of the property, (4) delay in reporting or delay in the discovery of a theft. In cases where professionals were concerned, (5) the ease with which they could remove themselves to a distant place was also a great difficulty. Improvements could be effected by (a) a proper system of sealing and improved seal-checking, (b) enforcing responsibility on the Traffic staff. Other defects were incurable. He thought that the responsibility of the Traffic staff could be enforced under the Railway Act in connection with certain offences, i.e., negligence on the part of the station masters in carrying out railway rules. There ought to be a police officer on the Railway Board and the Railway Board should be invested with authority to look into the working of the railway from that point of view. Speaking as a friend and sympathiser of the public he thought that Government should act on their behalf and if necessary legislate and enforce supervision which could best be done by the Railway Board. The existing state of affairs should not be allowed to continue. All that the railway cared for was its money.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, stated that the chief difficulties encountered in Railway Police investigations were (1) the locating of the scene of an offence, (2) the defective systems on railways with regard to the handling of goods, (3) delays in reporting, (4) the practical immunity of railway subordinates and menials from responsibility, (5) the delay in getting witnesses for examination. He cited instances of railway officers of the rank of station masters and traffic inspectors requesting the police to release their men such as porters for the simple reason that they feared a strike. (6) In many cases deliberate obstructions placed in the way of Police investigation by railway subordinates in authority at the station, (7) delays caused in getting definite information from other jurisdictions and from railway officials.

Mr. Magberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, referred to the difficulty in locating thefts and late reporting due to the fact that consignments passing through were weighed at transshipment stations and it could not be decided at once whether theft had taken place or not. This could only be decided at the destination station when the consignee took delivery. If he felt suspicious and asked for open delivery and then put in a claim to the Goods Superintendent it was only then that the occurrence of a theft was fixed. Open delivery was made in the presence of the police and the station master was authorized to do so without reference to the higher railway authorities. Matters would be greatly improved if, whenever there was any suspicion as to the occurrence of a theft, the matter were reported to the police at once. There should be a rigorous enforcement of seal-checking and prompt report to the police of any suspicious features about a consignment which should be detained at reporting stations. A copy of the invoice might suitably accompany consignments.

Inspector Glackan stated that the location of crime and the want of co-operation on the part of railway subordinates were the chief difficulties experienced and suggested that in the case of a theft committed in the yard the staff on duty during the night should be debited half the cost of the property stolen in proportion to their pay. If this suggestion were introduced for a period of six months there would be a reduction in yard thefts. Thefts in goods sheds were generally committed by, or with the knowledge of, the chowkidars and thefts from wagons were generally committed with the knowledge of the Shunting Master.

Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan stated that the difficulties were (1) the location of crime, (2) the lack of co-operation on the part of the railway, (3) the indifferent attitude of complainants towards the police, (4) the sending of grain bags in open and uncovered wagons without any proper railway or private marks. He suggested :— (a) Special seal-checking arrangements should be introduced. A special register should be maintained at railway stations, where there were police outposts and station houses. The guard in charge of the goods train, the number taker on duty and the police should check the seals of all wagons and pass remarks accordingly. (b) Checking of the seals of goods wagons in the presence of the joint police of the provinces at the boundaries of the provincial jurisdiction was most essential. (c) Some responsibility should be given to the railway staff beyond the present system of issuing only a wire. Personal interest and verbal report by the station master was necessary where there were station houses. At present when there was a shortage for instance at Nagpur the railway station wired down the line and at the same time sent the police a copy of the wire. This was done from the telegraph office. They should in addition make a verbal report. At present the Railway Police had no control over crime on the railways. It was left to the railway authorities to inform the police verbally. Reports were very necessary where there was a police station and a station master. When there was any negligence on the part of the railway staff in reporting, the matter should be brought to the notice of the District Traffic Superintendent. (d) Grain bags should not be loaded in open or uncovered wagons. (e) Every package should have railway as well as owner's marks. (f) The Claims Department should always inform the Superintendent, Railway Police, whenever any important claim in which there was reason to suspect a crime was lodged against the railway. (g) Property received as unclaimed at stations or deposited in the Lost Property Office should be published in the Weekly Notices, which might enable the police to trace some of the property. (h) There was always delay in reporting mostly due to want of checking facilities and in some instance to the railways holding their own departmental enquiries before lodging information with the police.

Sub-Inspector Muzhar Naji stated that the want of co-operation by the railway staff was the principal difficulty. Delay generally occurred in reporting cases.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula mentioned that (1) the place of crime could not be definitely located in many cases, (2) delay occurred in reporting. He suggested the appointment of special seal-checkers at the boundary of every station house and all guard changing stations as a remedy for No. (1). As regards (2) railway authorities should be required to report as early as possible.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the difficulties encountered in Railway Police investigations were want of co-operation by the railway staff in not giving information at once. When a case was detected railway servants instead of helping the Railway Police towards the ends of justice often attempted to hamper the investigation with a view to assisting the accused. No difficulty was experienced as regards the District Police.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the chief difficulty in investigation was that "the complainant is a traveller in haste to get to his destination. The witnesses are reluctant travellers also in a hurry to get away and the accused has, as a rule, melted into the 300 millions of India's population." He had not found that many enquiries had to be made from other jurisdictions in theft cases. Recently two cases had occurred in which the Rajputana Railway Police had had to work right up to the Punjab, but generally their inquiries were not carried into other jurisdictions as most of the crime was local. If Inspectors had shorter divisions (at present the average was 376 miles) they might get to know the roadside population better and would have time to see that their subordinates got that knowledge also. As it was the bulk of the Railway Police knew next to nothing about the nearest villages because they had not the time. Corruption of the railway subordinates had been admitted in railway conferences and it was natural that the police were not welcome as they found out all about the pickings of station masters and either demanded a share or exposed them, both of which incidents were annoying to the station masters.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that the principal difficulty was that practically no one outside the police was interested in the prevention or detection of crime. The one and only business of the railway was the running of trains and the carriage of goods and passengers. The staff had only to threaten to strike when the police became active to stifle further action. He suggested the placing of responsibility on the railway departments. He had reason to complain of delay in reporting, but not of difficulties due to reference to other jurisdictions.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali stated that the public had no connection with the Railway Police so did not assist in investigations; where there was co-operation between the Railway and District Police the zemindars rendered assistance, but where there was no such co-operation no help was received. The Traffic and Engineering staff did not help the police. He had experienced difficulties in connection with delay in reporting but had had no such experience in connection with reference to other jurisdictions as the jurisdictions were clear. He thought it advisable that local zemindars should be rewarded if they rendered assistance to the Railway Police.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, referred to Punjab Police Rule 2·2 and (with reference to clause (2) of the question, i.e., defects due to reference to other jurisdictions) stated that the principal difficulty, in Railway Police investigations was that in the Punjab the jurisdiction of the Railway Police was restricted to railway boundaries. It was true that under Section 58 of the Criminal Procedure Code, a Railway Police officer could pursue an offender into other jurisdictions, but such cases were of relatively infrequent occurrence, and even when a railway station house officer received reliable information that property stolen in a case which he was investigating was concealed in a house outside his jurisdiction, he had no power to search that house himself, but had to waste valuable time in calling upon the district station house officer concerned to cause a search to be made under the provisions of Section 166 of the Criminal Procedure Code. He considered therefore that so far as railway cases were concerned Railway Police officers should be given the powers of a station house officer throughout the civil district or districts in which his jurisdiction lay. There was no risk, if Railway Police officers were given those powers, of the investigation falling between two stools; there might be some friction between the two officers but that would not endanger the investigation. Officers would not continually throw cases at one another. They would be anxious to fill their returns with these cases. If they sent better returns, they would get credit. The Railway Police officer would then have considerably more prestige and would be able to call upon *zaildars* and village officials to give him the assistance they already rendered to district station house officers. Such wide powers were of course liable to be abused, but it had to be remembered that district station house officers would certainly take the most critical interest in the working of the railway station house officer within their respective jurisdictions. Referring to clause (1), delay in reporting, he stated that there was delay in those cases which had first been handled by the Claims Department. In some cases delays were unavoidable but in others the presence in the Claims Department of officers who could recognize promptly instances of reasonable suspicion that a cognizable offence had been committed would obviate such difficulties.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that the District Police looked upon Railway Police work as an extra burden and only in rare cases did the upper subordinates join the Railway Police in their investigations which was probably due to insufficient staff. Difficulties also arose in getting suspected railway employees immediately relieved by their officers for the purpose of the investigation. *Lambardars*, etc., had no direct official connection with the Railway Police and therefore naturally did not care to help the force. The Railway Police should be consulted in the appointment of *lambardars*, *zaildars*, and *sufaid poshes*. In investigations outside railway jurisdiction in British Territory the restrictions laid down in the Criminal Procedure Code should be abolished. Furthermore, the registration of railway cases in the district police station registers was necessary. With reference to query (1) of the

question, he stated that delays occurred in reporting due to wagons not being promptly checked, and that with regard to query (2), the provisions laid down in paragraph 356 of the Traffic Manual were not observed by the railway staff concerned.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that "the outstanding difficulty is the aloofness of the District Police (except in cases when they are specially called upon to assist) from the Railway Police." Another difficulty was that the Railway Police did not receive any assistance from *zaildars*, *lambardars*, etc. When appointing *zaildars*, Deputy Commissioners should ascertain whether the candidates had rendered any assistance to the Railway Police and when writing up their books, they should enquire whether the men had rendered any special assistance. They should also direct the Railway Police to note down in their books cases in which they had rendered assistance. When Deputy Commissioners were on tour they should hold meetings and summon Railway Sub-Inspectors and enquire from them about the assistance they had received from the local authorities and should take action on complaints made. If it were found that the local people had given special assistance, they should be rewarded. The principle which underlay the inclusion of railway cases in the annual statements of the District Police should also govern the registration of such cases in the thanas concerned. A copy of the daily case diaries should be submitted to the District Superintendent of Police through the station house officer instead of sending them direct. All legal restrictions regarding investigations in the district by the Railway Police should be abolished. With reference to query (1), he stated that delays did occur and instanced the case of a wagon with a broken seal in which the railway staff sent the results of their enquiries to the Police after much delay. Claims cases also were reported after much delay. With reference to query (2) he stated that the railway staff was not very particular in acting up to paragraph 310 of the North Western Railway Traffic Manual; therefore defects arose in referring to other jurisdictions.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that the principal difficulties encountered in Railway Police investigations were as follows:—(a) Difficulty in localizing thefts from seal-broken wagons and running trains. (b) The Railway Police had no hold on village officials or members of the public and in the present conditions in India people had no sense of responsibility in coming forward to help the Administration in suppressing crime. (c) The public generally had no interest in Railway Police work; the complainant got his claim settled and at times received more than he had really lost, and did not care for the success or failure of the police case. In many cases the Railway Police had to run after the complainant for weeks to secure details of the property missing or stolen. (d) Much of the property which became the subject of thefts was unidentifiable and when recovered without the packing material which clever offenders always made haste to destroy was not easily proved to be the stolen property. The complainants themselves refrained from identifying their property when recovered as it generally had suffered and deteriorated and disclaimed ownership so that they might obtain their claim in full and not part claim and part damaged property. (e) The question of jurisdiction often delayed actual investigation. Police subordinates were inclined to try to shift cases to other jurisdictions. Such was often the case when thefts were reported from running trains. (f) Shortage of investigating staff who frequently had to cover considerable distances in the course of their enquiries. The following remedies were suggested:—(1) Extensive and careful seal-checking not only at boundaries of Provinces and Railway Police jurisdictions, but practically at all important stations or if important stations were far apart at a distance of every 20 or 30 miles. The Traffic running staff should co-operate whole-heartedly in this work and should not create difficulties by hurrying trains. (2) Recommendations by the Railway Police for rewards for good work and for punishments for bad work of village officials should be given due weight as was done on reports of Revenue officials or District Police. Selected *zaildars* or *lambardars* who constantly helped the Railway Police, in any particular locality where crime had been successfully dealt with should on the recommendation of the Superintendent of railway police be given an authority by the District Traffic Superintendent on production of which he might be issued with a ticket at half fare for journeys within the jurisdiction of the railway police station in which or close to which he resided. This concession would be much appreciated and would not cause much loss to the railway, as in each police station jurisdiction there would not be more than half a dozen such concessions and the concession would stimulate travelling by a higher class of carriage to a great extent. *Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General*, endorsed this suggestion. (3) Persons demanding a claim from railways for consignments stolen or lost should not get their claims settled until the police report had been received. Gazetted officers of the Railway Police should however personally see that such investigations and final reports were not unnecessarily delayed. *Mr. Tomkins, Inspector General*, agreed with this suggestion. (4) There was no remedy for this defect. (5) The police should register a case immediately without trying to settle the question of jurisdiction. Gazetted officers and Circle Inspectors should see that along with the settlement of the question of jurisdiction proper investigation was also made in the case. (6) The creation of a Criminal Investigation Agency, the officers of which would not have to do purely routine work. A staff of one Inspector, two Sub-Inspectors, four head constables and eight foot constables (the lower subordinates to include two trackers for employment in Bannu and Dera Ismail Khan Districts) was required for

this agency. They would undertake important investigations under the orders of the Superintendent. *Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General*, endorsed this suggestion.

Question No. 30.—What are the rules regarding the investigation of cases occurring within railway limits and providing for the co-operation of the District Police in the investigation of such cases? Are these rules satisfactory?

United Provinces.

The United Provinces Police Manual, Rule 4, Paragraph V, states "When the attendance and co-operation of the District Police is considered necessary by a Railway Police officer or *vice versa*, the officer to whom the requisition is made will proceed in person or, if otherwise engaged, depute the highest officer available to render the necessary assistance. All ranks of the District Police (including chowkidars) and of the Railway Police shall render mutual assistance to each other in the execution of their duty.

Paragraph VI. All thefts from running goods trains shall be primarily registered at the railway police station within the jurisdiction of which the theft is discovered. If the theft is localized, a copy of the information should be sent immediately to the district police station having jurisdiction over the scene of the occurrence. On receipt of the information the officer in charge of the district police station shall register the offence and at once endeavour to discover what bad characters were absent from their villages on the night of the theft; if there are sufficient grounds for such action, he should search the houses of suspected railway thieves for the stolen property of which he will receive a full description.

Paragraph VII. Railway Police officers ought generally to ask for the co-operation of the District Police in the following cases:—

- (1) When a serious theft has occurred from a wagon or shed.
- (2) When a series of thefts of property entrusted to the railway officials as carriers occurs from goods wagons or sheds, or of railway materials, carriage fixings, etc., from station yards and sidings * * * *

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, considered the rules satisfactory, but invited a reference to his remarks under question No. 29 (2).

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi considered that the rules were satisfactory, but suggested that the failure to comply with them should be dealt with severely, as pointed out by him in his reply to question No. 29.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shunker considered the rules satisfactory.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated that all cases of theft from running trains and passengers and goods within railway limits were taken up by the Railway Police. Other offences under the Indian Penal Code committed beyond the station limits were taken up by the local police, except in the case of the Police of Native States. Cases of running goods train thefts were also reported to the local Police, where the case (without a number) was registered and enquired into, but not with any energy. This arrangement was not satisfactory. In fact, often no attention was given and no pains were taken by the local Police to trace the perpetrators of Railway Police cases, as they had themselves enough work to do, and owing to this fact local thieves remained at large.

Bombay.

Rule 778, page 372, Bombay District Police Manual includes all the rules laid down in the United Provinces Police Manual with the exception of double registration of running goods train thefts.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General, stated that the rules were not altogether satisfactory and were under revision.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, did not consider the rules altogether satisfactory. He thought that they might be made more drastic and was of opinion that the Railway Police had enough to do without their attention being distracted by ordinary crimes committed by residents of the surrounding villages and towns which the District Police were in a better position to dispose of. "Once the Railway Police move outside the fencing they are strangers in a strange land and have not the same standing or authority as the District Police." There should be a double system of registration. Examples:—

- (1) A wagon from "A" arrives at "C" with a seal broken and two packages missing. The guard reports that while the train was held up outside "B" thieves opened the wagons and took away the packages. The theft should be registered by the District and Railway Police. The theft might have been committed by the guard himself or by the residents of a village 10 miles off in district limits. The case would eventually remain on the register of the police who traced the offence. If untraced, it should remain on both.
- (2) A wagon leaves "A" and arrives at "B" with doors open and four packages missing. "A" is the starting or checking station, "B" is the next stopping station. Between "A" and "B" there is a gradient. The case may have been one of intentional short loading or the train may have been boarded by villagers on the gradient. Same procedure as in (1).

- (3) A wagon leaves "A" seals intact and arrives at "F" five stations away without stopping. The door is found open and four packages found short. The scene of offence cannot be located over a long distance. The Railway Police only should register the case.
- (4) The Railway Police constable on duty in the yard at night comes across three thieves who escape taking two bundles with them. Both Railway and District Police should register the case as the thieves came from district limits. If undetected the case should remain on both registers.
- (5) A gateman's house within the distant signals is burgled by thieves. Although the house is within the distant signals the Railway Police are handicapped by want of local knowledge and authority and cannot be expected to follow up the case with success. The case should be accepted by the District Police.

The responsibility of the District Police, in his opinion, was very real. The Railway Police and the District Police were one fraternity and their object should be to confound the common enemy. This burden should be so shared as to give the best chance of success. The existing rules threw practically the whole initial burden on the Railway Police. The District Police should take a greater share of the responsibility. The rule ordering the Railway Police to send their constables to the District Police to learn the bad characters and *vice versa* had died a natural death. It was essential that there should be more co-operation.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that immediate information was given to the District Police in case of necessity and assistance was received. The procedure was satisfactory.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that rules regarding co-operation existed but were not satisfactory.

Sub-Inspector Rege did not consider the rules satisfactory and suggested that in the case of running train thefts both the District Police and the Railway Police should register the offence.

Madras.

Rule 656 of the Madras Police Executive Orders, Volume I, lays down :—

- (1) There should be the closest co-operation between the District and Railway Police.
- (2) The Railway Police should be in a position to afford the greatest assistance to the District Police in arresting offenders who are trying to escape, and in noting the movements of criminals.
- (3) In matters of placing obstructions on the line, tearing up rails, throwing stones at trains, and such like, the help of the District Police should be promptly sought.
- (4) In the event of crime being committed in the limits of the District Police, but in the close neighbourhood of the Railway, the Railway Police shall take any legal action pending the arrival of the District Police.
- (5) Whenever a Circle Inspector of the District Police finds himself in the same place as the Superintendent of Government Railway Police, he should visit that officer, and similarly, Inspectors of the Railway Police should frequently visit superior officers of the District Police.

The witnesses were of opinion that the rules were satisfactory.

Bengal.

Police Regulations, Bengal, Volume VI, Rules 102 and 103 include all the rules laid down in the United Provinces Manual with the exception of that relating to the double registration of running goods train thefts.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General of Police, thought that the present rules were satisfactory, but that it would be an advantage to have some fundamental rules in a Police Manual for the whole of India.

Mr. Farmer, District Superintendent of Police, 24-Pergannas, thought that it was not in the nature of sub-inspectors, assistant sub-inspectors or constables to co-operate except under compulsion and no rules that could be devised would overcome this disinclination to take an interest in the crime for the control of which another officer was responsible.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, thought that the rules were satisfactory in themselves, but required more time than the local officer could spare.

Inspector D. N. Mukharji agreed.

The other witnesses considered the rules satisfactory.

Assam.

Assam Police Manual, Part V, Rules 205 to 207 include all the rules laid down in the United Provinces Police Manual with the exception of that relating to double registration in the case of running goods train thefts.

The witnesses, including the Assam Government, were of opinion that the rules were satisfactory.

Bihar and Orissa.

Bihar and Orissa Police Manual Rules 498 and 499 include all the rules laid down in the United Provinces Police Manual with the exception of that relating to the double registration of running goods train thefts.

The Bihar and Orissa Government was of opinion that the rules were satisfactory.

Mr. Macrae, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, thought that the rules were satisfactory. The Bihar Manual was drawn up from the Bengal Manual originally. There was some trouble about jurisdiction during the recent strike at Howrah. The Traffic Department were not able to get the assistance of the Police at Shalimar, and a reference had to be made to the Inspector-General, Bihar and Orissa. There was some doubt as to who was to reinforce the Railway Police in such circumstance. The Railway Police had no reserve. They had to go to the District Police. In the recent case the misunderstanding was immediately removed by the District Magistrate at Howrah who held that Bengal should reinforce the Railway Police who were at Shalimar. The matter was under discussion between the Inspector-General, Bengal, and the Inspector-General, Bihar and Orissa.

Messrs. Ezechiel and Cook, Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, Inspectors Inder Sen Sachar and Fauzdar Narain Kuar were of opinion that the rules were satisfactory.

Central Provinces.

Central Provinces Police Manual Appendix A contains the rules laid down in the United Provinces Police Manual with the exception of that relating to the double registration of running goods train thefts.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that co-operation was insisted on and in practice worked satisfactorily. The Railway Sub-Inspector and the District Sub-Inspector having been trained at the same training school, there was a great deal of *esprit de corps* which resulted in very satisfactory relations.

Messrs. Hurst and Mayberry agreed that the rules were satisfactory but the latter added "if enforced."

Inspector Glaekan considered that the rules were satisfactory.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

The rules provide for the deputation of constables from district police stations on the line of rail — one in uniform and one in plain clothes — to railway stations within the area of their jurisdiction to watch for the arrival and departure by the railway of known criminals or suspicious characters. Also if the assistance of the District Police is considered necessary, a copy of the information will be sent to the district police station with a request for such assistance. On receipt of the request, the officer in charge of the station will at once proceed to give the required assistance. The receipt of the information and a note of the steps taken to assist the Railway Police will be entered in the general diary of the district police station. All ranks of the District Police and of the Railway Police are expected to render mutual assistance to each other in the execution of their duty.

There were no complaints.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General of Railway Police, stated that the Rajputana Railway Police followed the rules in force in the United Provinces which were satisfactory. As the Rajputana Railway Police jurisdiction was, with the exception of the Ajmer-Merwara district, entirely within Native States, the Railway Police registered all cases occurring within ceded territory.

Sind.

Judicial Department Resolution No. 1100, dated 24th February, 1910, contains all the rules laid down in the United Provinces Police Manual with the exception of that relating to the double registration of running goods train thefts.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, did not consider that the rules were satisfactory. See his reply to question 16.

Punjab.

Punjab Police Rules, Appendix 2·9 (3) lay down—

- (i) The District Police shall, as far as possible, depute one or more constables in plain clothes to railway stations within the area of their jurisdictions to watch for the arrival or departure by the railway of known criminals or suspicious characters. Such constables shall report themselves to the railway police officer travelling in passenger trains, who will enter their names and any information they may communicate in his Train Diary Book. Any information received from the travelling railway police officer will be communicated by the plain clothes constables to their station-houses.

* * * * *

- (vi) It is not necessary that other than serious crime, the definition of which must vary according to local circumstances, occurring within railway limits should ordinarily be reported to the District Police. But all serious crime, including offences of which special reports have, under the Police Rules, to be submitted by the district police stations, should be specially reported at once by the Railway Police to the Superintendent of District Police and, to the District Magistrate. The use of the telegraph for these reports is advisable in cases in which delay would otherwise ensue.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General, stated, with regard to the suggestion that murders should be taken up by the District Police, that the investigating officer should be guided by rule 25.7 (1) of the Police Rules, which gave full discretion to the Superintendent of Police to decide in which jurisdiction the investigation should be made. The District Superintendent of Police had powers to order that a case should not be taken up by the Railway Police but by the local station-house officer. He did not agree with the suggestion that the Railway Police should not take up those cases as a certain amount of preliminary investigation had to be made before it could be decided that a case was purely a Railway or a District affair. Consequently, he would leave things as they were. Registration of cases in both *thanas* (District and Railway) would lead to jealousy, *vide* his remarks under question 16.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, referred to Rule 2.2 of the Punjab Police Rules and stated that all cognizable cases occurring within railway limits were taken up by the Railway Police except offences occurring in or in close proximity to dwelling quarters. That exception did not for obvious reasons apply in the case of stations within Native States. As regards co-operation between the District and Railway Police, it might be said that with the exception of the gazetted ranks of each force, co-operation was conspicuous by its absence. The Superintendent of District Police should take an interest in Railway Police work, if for no higher reason than the fact that Railway Police crime was included in the District returns. But the criminal statistics of the district police station were not burdened with railway cases, and it was practically impossible to stimulate interest in railway crime in the station-house officer or his Circle Inspector. He proposed to amend the existing rules to provide as follows:—(1) That offences in dwelling quarters, etc., should continue to be registered and investigated by the District Police. (2) That all cases of murder within railway limits should be registered and investigated not by the Railway Police but by the District Police. Such cases of murder as had come to his notice had either been (a) cases arising out of district feuds and quarrels which would have occurred whether there was or there was not a railway line, or (b) cases in which although the murder occurred elsewhere the corpse was dumped on the line in order to create the impression that the deceased had been accidentally run over. It was important to notice that if these amendments were accepted it would still be incumbent upon the Railway Police officer to take all preliminary steps to arrest offenders, secure evidence, etc., pending the arrival of the district police, *vide* Section 23 of the Police Act. (3) Cases under Sections 126 and 127 of the Railway Act, cases of dacoity, robbery, theft from running goods trains and thefts and burglaries in goods yards and sheds should be registered both in the railway police station concerned and in those district police stations within which lay the sections of the line on which those offences were known to have occurred. The investigation should be a joint one, because such offences were sometimes the work of railway employees and at other times the work of local thieves. (4) Practically, all the remaining crime was peculiar to the railways and should therefore be registered and investigated by the Railway Police alone.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, and *Inspector Ghulam Dastgir*, referred to their remarks against question 29 and stated that the rules should be amended in accordance with their suggestions made in reply to that question.

North-West Frontier Province.

The North-West Frontier Provinces Police Rules are identical with the Punjab Police Rules on the subject.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, was of opinion that the rules were satisfactory and required no alteration. The powers of investigation possessed by the Railway Police were governed by the Criminal Procedure Code and were identical with those of the District Police.

Question No. 31.—*What is the present rule defining the limits of railway police jurisdiction and do you consider it satisfactory?*

United Provinces.

The United Provinces Government Railway Police Manual, Rule 4, gives the following definition:—

I. (a) The expression "railway limits" means the railway fencing or boundary of the line, and includes all classes of property described in sub-sections (a), (b) and (c) of Section 3 (4) of the Railway Act (IX of 1890), within those limits.

(b) The expression "limits of a station yard" includes land within railway limits between the distant signal of a station.

Note.—Residential quarters must ordinarily be treated as outside the limits of a station yard.

II. All crimes committed within the limits of a station yard, and (wherever they are committed) all offences in running goods or passenger trains and offences against the Railway Act shall be registered and investigated by the Government Railway Police.

III. All offences committed outside the limits of a station yard (except those occurring in running trains, goods or passenger, and offences under the Railway Act) shall be registered and investigated by the District Police.

Compare this rule with the Assam Police rule.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, considered that the rule was a good working one.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, considered the rule satisfactory.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi and *Sub-Inspector Pearey Shunker*, agreed.

Inspector Farrant, could not think of any better arrangement. He stated that the general opinion of the railway community was that all offences occurring in residential quarters occupied by railway servants should be registered and investigated by the Railway Police. He was not in favour of this suggestion which would entail a great deal of extra work for the Railway Police, and as the offences chiefly consisted of thefts from bungalows, etc., and were invariably the work of local thieves, the District Police were in a better position to investigate.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz did not consider that the rules were satisfactory, but gave no reasons.

Bombay.

See Rule 777, page 371 of the District Police Manual which gives the following definition :—

(a) "Railway limits" may be defined as the area owned or legally occupied by a Railway Company for the purposes of the railroad and the carriage of goods and passengers. A road over or under a railway is not usually railway property and, unless it is so, the police duties arising on it are generally to be discharged by the District Police.

(b) The expression "limits of a station yard" means all traffic lines and premises included in railway limits within the distant signals.

(c) The definition of "railway limits" given in clause (a) above covers every place and building used for the purposes of the rail-road and the carriage of goods and passengers.

(d) As a general working rule, it may be taken, unless in the circumstances of any particular case there is something repugnant to it, that in the mofussil the Railway Police exercise jurisdiction over all lands and buildings defined in Section 3, (4) (a) of the Indian Railways Act, 1890, unless the latter are so grouped or situated outside the station yard, as the term is generally understood, as to make it advisable, for better supervision, to combine them with lands in District Police jurisdiction.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General, was of opinion that the rule was not quite satisfactory. Each station should be dealt with on its merits. So far as possible, residential quarters should be excluded from railway police jurisdiction.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, considered the rule unsatisfactory. The railway police jurisdiction should be confined to the area within the fencing along the line and round the "yard" as the term was generally used and should not be extended to all the buildings included in railway limits.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that all cases under the Indian Penal Code within the distant signals were registered and investigated by the Railway Police. Similarly all cases under the Railway Act and cases occurring in running goods trains and passenger trains were registered and investigated by the Railway Police along the whole length of line in the Bombay Presidency. The District Police should also register and investigate running goods train thefts as the offenders came from the jurisdiction of the District Police and the stolen property eventually found its way there.

Sub-Inspector Rege said that the rule was not satisfactory.

Madras.

Police Order 620, Volume I, defines the jurisdiction of the Railway Police as follows :—

The jurisdiction of the Railway Police extends over the area included within the boundary of the railway line and that covered by stations, station yards and goods sheds, but does not extend to the lands occupied by the dwellings of the railway staff. This area is called "railway limits."

The rule was considered generally satisfactory except in the cases of the local police having jurisdiction over railway workshops.

Bengal.

The rules are contained in P.R.B., Volume VI, rules 68 and 92.

Rule 68.

The expression "railway limits" means railway fencing, that is, the boundary of the line and all stations, goods-sheds, station yards and buildings on railway land at all stations; also all ghats and ferries in the exclusive possession of the railway companies, but not lands acquired for blocks of residences of railway servants at Howrah, Bandel Junction, Ranigunj, Asansol, Jharra, Rampur Hat, Burdwan, Lilloah, Ondal, Sitarampur, Barakar on the East Indian Railway; at Kanchrapara, Damukdia, Katihar, Sara, Goalundo Ghat, Parbatipur, Saidpur, Siliguri, Lalmonirhat, Barnes Junction, Rajbari, Khulna and Sealdah on the Eastern Bengal Railway system; and at Khargpur on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Rule 92.

All cognizable crime committed within railway limits shall be registered and investigated by the Railway Police. It is not necessary to wait for a complaint of a railway official except in cases under Section 101, Railway Act.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General, Messrs. Bradley and Ezechiel, Superintendents of Police and Inspector S. C. Banerji, considered the rule satisfactory.

Mr. Farmer, District Superintendent of Police, 24-Parganas, stated that it did not seem feasible to define a better boundary though this was not entirely satisfactory. The railway police jurisdiction might be made to include all land within railway fencing at railway stations; and between railway stations and the land falling within the railway fencing or railway telegraph posts whichever was further from the track. This was necessary to deal with damage to telegraph posts and wires.

Inspector D. N. Mukharji stated that the Railway Police now investigated crime over the whole length of the line. Formerly, the Railway Police only dealt with crime committed within the distant signals, but that system was abolished in 1909. The present rule was satisfactory. Very few cases of crime occurred beyond the distant signals. Running train thefts, obstruction cases and murders were dealt with by the Railway Police if committed within railway limits. He did not approve of any system of joint registration and investigation by the Railway and District Police in the case of running train thefts, even with the object of giving the District Police an interest in tracing cases. At present intimation was sent to the District Police in the case of running train thefts and whenever necessary they were asked to co-operate.

Assam.

Assam Police Manual, Part V, Rule 205, states as follows :—

All cognizable offences committed against the person or property (except those occurring in running trains, goods or passenger, and offences under the Railway Act) and all cases of mischief caused to telegraph posts or wires or wire-thefts committed on lines running through British territory in which the scene of the offence is outside the limits of a station yard shall be registered and investigated by the District Police.

The rule is apparently adapted from the rule in force in the United Provinces and is drafted more for the guidance of the District Police. In the opening sentence the word "cognizable" is mentioned. This does not find entry in the rule in the United Provinces Manual. The expression "limits of a station yard" is not defined in the Assam Manual.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent of Railway Police, Chittagong, considered the rule satisfactory.

The Assam Government agreed.

Inspector Syed Hashmatullah was of opinion that all crimes beyond station limits except those occurring in running trains and Railway Act cases, etc., should be taken up by the local police as such crimes were committed by local people and the local police could do better in such cases.

Bihar and Orissa.

Bihar and Orissa Police Manual, Rule 462, states as follows :—

The expression "railway limits" means railway fencing, that is, the boundary of the line and of all stations, goods sheds, station yards and buildings on railway land at all stations, also all ghats and ferries in the exclusive possession of railway companies but not lands acquired for blocks of residences for railway servants at Madhupur, Jhujha, Mokameh, Dinapur, Gaya, Buxar, Sahebgunge, Jamalpur, Dhaubad, Giridih, Gomoh and Gujandi on the East Indian Railway; at Khargpur, Chakradharpur, Adra and Khurda Road on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway, and at Sonapur and Samastipur on the Bengal and North-Western Railway. For definitions of "railway servant", "ferry", "railway" and other kindred expressions see section 3 of the Indian Railways Act (IX of 1890).

The Bihar Government was of opinion that the rule was satisfactory.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, was of opinion that the rule was satisfactory. He did not think that there was any objection to the system prevailing in Assam where the Railway Police had been given concurrent jurisdiction in adjoining district *thanas*, so that sub-inspectors of the Railway Police could make a search in the jurisdiction of any particular police station without calling on the officer in charge of that station for assistance. He thought, however, that the Railway Police always did call on the District Police to help them. It was giving the Railway Police a very much bigger jurisdiction than they ordinarily possessed. If they wanted any enquiries made in the ordinary District Police jurisdiction, they would probably be told by the District Police, "You have got the powers, make your own enquiries". They would be handicapped in having no local knowledge, and they also would not have sufficient staff, and the District Police would be shirking the performance of duties which were legitimately theirs.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent of Railway Police, Khargpur, was of opinion that the rule was satisfactory, but cases under Sections 126, 127, 128, 129 and 130 of the Railway Act should be investigated by the District Police. They were cases of obstruction on the line, stone-throwing and cases of that description.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, Inspectors Inder Sen Sachar and Poudar Narayan Kuar were of opinion that the rules were satisfactory.

Central Provinces.

The Central Provinces Police Manual, Appendix A. V, states :—

The Railway Police will register and investigate—

(a) all offences committed on land within railway limits between the distant signals of a station.

III. All offences committed outside the limits of a station yard (except those occurring in running trains, goods or passenger, and offences under the Railway Act) shall be registered and investigated by the District Police.

Compare this rule with the Assam Police rule.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, considered that the rule was a good working one.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, considered the rule satisfactory.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi and Sub-Inspector Pearey Shunker, agreed.

Inspector Farrant, could not think of any better arrangement. He stated that the general opinion of the railway community was that all offences occurring in residential quarters occupied by railway servants should be registered and investigated by the Railway Police. He was not in favour of this suggestion which would entail a great deal of extra work for the Railway Police, and as the offences chiefly consisted of thefts from bungalows, etc., and were invariably the work of local thieves, the District Police were in a better position to investigate.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz did not consider that the rules were satisfactory, but gave no reasons.

Bombay.

See Rule 777, page 371 of the District Police Manual which gives the following definition :—

(a) "Railway limits" may be defined as the area owned or legally occupied by a Railway Company for the purposes of the railroad and the carriage of goods and passengers. A road over or under a railway is not usually railway property and, unless it is so, the police duties arising on it are generally to be discharged by the District Police.

(b) The expression "limits of a station yard" means all traffic lines and premises included in railway limits within the distant signals.

(c) The definition of "railway limits" given in clause (a) above covers every place and building used for the purposes of the rail-road and the carriage of goods and passengers.

(d) As a general working rule, it may be taken, unless in the circumstances of any particular case there is something repugnant to it, that in the mofussil the Railway Police exercise jurisdiction over all lands and buildings defined in Section 3, (4) (a) of the Indian Railways Act, 1890, unless the latter are so grouped or situated outside the station yard, as the term is generally understood, as to make it advisable, for better supervision, to combine them with lands in District Police jurisdiction.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General, was of opinion that the rule was not quite satisfactory. Each station should be dealt with on its merits. So far as possible, residential quarters should be excluded from railway police jurisdiction.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, considered the rule unsatisfactory. The railway police jurisdiction should be confined to the area within the fencing along the line and round the "yard" as the term was generally used and should not be extended to all the buildings included in railway limits.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that all cases under the Indian Penal Code within the distant signals were registered and investigated by the Railway Police. Similarly all cases under the Railway Act and cases occurring in running goods trains and passenger trains were registered and investigated by the Railway Police along the whole length of line in the Bombay Presidency. The District Police should also register and investigate running goods train thefts as the offenders came from the jurisdiction of the District Police and the stolen property eventually found its way there.

Sub-Inspector Rege said that the rule was not satisfactory.

Madras.

Police Order 620, Volume I, defines the jurisdiction of the Railway Police as follows :—

The jurisdiction of the Railway Police extends over the area included within the boundary of the railway line and that covered by stations, station yards and goods sheds, but does not extend to the lands occupied by the dwellings of the railway staff. This area is called "railway limits."

The rule was considered generally satisfactory except in the cases of the local police having jurisdiction over railway workshops.

Bengal.

The rules are contained in P.R.B., Volume VI, rules 68 and 92.

Rule 68.

The expression "railway limits" means railway fencing, that is, the boundary of the line and all stations, goods-sheds, station yards and buildings on railway land at all stations; also all ghats and ferries in the exclusive possession of the railway companies, but not lands acquired for blocks of residences of railway servants at Howrah, Bandel Junction, Raniganj, Asansol, Jharlia, Rampur Hat, Burdwan, Lilloah, Ondal, Sitarampur, Barakar on the East Indian Railway; at Kanchrapara, Damukdia, Katihar, Sara, Goalundo Ghat, Parbatipur, Saidpur, Siliguri, Lalmonirhat, Barnes Junction, Rajbari, Khulna and Sealdah on the Eastern Bengal Railway system; and at Khargpur on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Rule 92.

All cognizable crime committed within railway limits shall be registered and investigated by the Railway Police. It is not necessary to wait for a complaint of a railway official except in cases under Section 101, Railway Act,

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General, Messrs. Bradley and Ezechiel, Superintendents of Police and Inspector S. C. Banerji, considered the rule satisfactory.

Mr. Farmer, District Superintendent of Police, 24-Pargannas, stated that it did not seem feasible to define a better boundary though this was not entirely satisfactory. The railway police jurisdiction might be made to include all land within railway fencing at railway stations; and between railway stations and the land falling within the railway fencing or railway telegraph posts whichever was further from the track. This was necessary to deal with damage to telegraph posts and wires.

Inspector D. N. Mukharji stated that the Railway Police now investigated crime over the whole length of the line. Formerly, the Railway Police only dealt with crime committed within the distant signals, but that system was abolished in 1909. The present rule was satisfactory. Very few cases of crime occurred beyond the distant signals. Running train thefts, obstruction cases and murders were dealt with by the Railway Police if committed within railway limits. He did not approve of any system of joint registration and investigation by the Railway and District Police in the case of running train thefts, even with the object of giving the District Police an interest in tracing cases. At present intimation was sent to the District Police in the case of running train thefts and whenever necessary they were asked to co-operate.

Assam.

Assam Police Manual, Part V, Rule 205, states as follows :—

All cognizable offences committed against the person or property (except those occurring in running trains, goods or passenger, and offences under the Railway Act) and all cases of mischief caused to telegraph posts or wires or wire-thefts committed on lines running through British territory in which the scene of the offence is outside the limits of a station yard shall be registered and investigated by the District Police.

The rule is apparently adapted from the rule in force in the United Provinces and is drafted more for the guidance of the District Police. In the opening sentence the word "cognizable" is mentioned. This does not find entry in the rule in the United Provinces Manual. The expression "limits of a station yard" is not defined in the Assam Manual.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent of Railway Police, Chittagong, considered the rule satisfactory.

The Assam Government agreed.

Inspector Syed Hashmatullah was of opinion that all crimes beyond station limits except those occurring in running trains and Railway Act cases, etc., should be taken up by the local police as such crimes were committed by local people and the local police could do better in such cases.

Bihar and Orissa.

Bihar and Orissa Police Manual, Rule 462, states as follows :—

The expression "railway limits" means railway fencing, that is, the boundary of the line and of all stations, goods sheds, station yards and buildings on railway land at all stations; also all ghats and ferries in the exclusive possession of railway companies but not lands acquired for blocks of residences for railway servants at Madhupur, Jhajha, Mokameh, Dinapur, Gaya, Buxar, Sahebgunge, Jamalpur, Dhanbad, Giridih, Gomoh and Gujandi on the East Indian Railway; at Khargpur, Chakradharpur, Adra and Khurda Road on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway, and at Sonapur and Samastipur on the Bengal and North-Western Railway. For definitions of "railway servant", "ferry", "railway" and other kindred expressions see section 3 of the Indian Railways Act (IX of 1890).

The Bihar Government was of opinion that the rule was satisfactory.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, was of opinion that the rule was satisfactory. He did not think that there was any objection to the system prevailing in Assam where the Railway Police had been given concurrent jurisdiction in adjoining district thanas, so that sub-inspectors of the Railway Police could make a search in the jurisdiction of any particular police station without calling on the officer in charge of that station for assistance. He thought, however, that the Railway Police always did call on the District Police to help them. It was giving the Railway Police a very much bigger jurisdiction than they ordinarily possessed. If they wanted any enquiries made in the ordinary District Police jurisdiction, they would probably be told by the District Police, "You have got the powers, make your own enquiries". They would be handicapped in having no local knowledge, and they also would not have sufficient staff, and the District Police would be shirking the performance of duties which were legitimately theirs.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent of Railway Police, Khargpur, was of opinion that the rule was satisfactory, but cases under Sections 126, 127, 128, 129 and 130 of the Railway Act should be investigated by the District Police. They were cases of obstruction on the line, stone-throwing and cases of that description.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, Inspectors Inder Sen Sachar and Fouzdar Narayan Kuar were of opinion that the rules were satisfactory.

Central Provinces.

The Central Provinces Police Manual, Appendix A. V, states :—

The Railway Police will register and investigate—

(a) all offences committed on land within railway limits between the distant signals of a station.

Note.—Railway residential settlements are generally treated as outside the limits of the railway police jurisdiction, but in special cases exceptions may be made to this rule.

(b) all offences committed on running trains;

(c) all offences against the Railway Act.

All other offences will be registered and investigated by the District Police.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, and Inspector Gluckan, considered the rule satisfactory.

Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan considered that the rule was satisfactory, but that the distribution of work between the District and Railway Police was defective. The Railway Police were not posted at every station but they were responsible for the crime of all the railway stations in their jurisdiction. The result was that crimes committed on railway stations where there was no Railway Police mostly remained undetected and the menial staff with the assistance of the local bad characters formed into gangs and started committing serious offences on the railway unnoticed and unchecked by the Railway Police. The District Police however close they might be took no proper interest in such matters owing to the question of jurisdiction and responsibility. Cases of theft of goods and railway property at stations where there were no Railway Police should be taken up by the District Police. This system would facilitate the prevention and detection of such crime materially, as it was obvious that most criminals who committed crime on such roadside stations hailed from the District jurisdiction and the stolen property was disposed of in the same jurisdiction. No one lived in the jurisdiction of the Railway Police. The greatest distance between the Railway Police outposts in the Central Provinces was about 50 miles.

Hyderabad.

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the Railway Police exercised jurisdiction over railway lands irrespective of station yards and the line between stations. The system was satisfactory.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the Rajputana Railway Police followed the rules in force in the United Provinces which were satisfactory.

Sind.

File G R. Judicial Department No. 1100, dated 24th February 1910, which is identical with Bombay District Police Manual, Rule 777.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, did not consider the rules satisfactory. All crime in railway quarters and workshops should be dealt with by the District Police. All railway crime at the end of the year should be shown on the returns of the District Police Stations and the District Police should have equal responsibility in the matter. He did not think it was advisable that the Railway Police jurisdiction should be extended to District areas.

Punjab.

Punjab Police Rules, Volume I, Rule 2-2, states:—

The jurisdiction of the Railway Police is confined to "railway limits," which includes all ground and buildings within the railway boundary fencing.

Provided that all offences committed in or in close proximity to dwelling houses or barracks of railway servants shall be taken cognizance of and investigated by the District Police. This proviso, however, does not extend to stations situated in Native States where the Railway Police take cognizance of such offences.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General, stated that the railway police jurisdiction extended to railway limits and he did not recommend any alteration by which the Railway Police would have jurisdiction outside railway limits, which would entail the alteration of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent and Inspector Ghulam Dastgir referred to their suggestions made in answer to questions 29 and 30.

North-West Frontier Province.

The limits of railway police jurisdiction are defined in the Police Rules, Volume I, Rule 2-2, which is identical with the Punjab rule.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, was of opinion that no alteration was necessary. Offences in dwelling houses which were the work of local people were better investigated by the District Police who had special knowledge of such thieves and offenders and had better facilities for carrying on such investigations.

Question No. 32.—Have you any system for the special training of railway police officers and men? Do you think such a system is likely to give useful results?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that there was no system of special training of railway police officers and he did not think that any special training would do much good.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, stated that there was no special training. It was absolutely essential in order to get railway police work done efficiently to have men with special training. The training of the rank and file should be done in a central training school. Sergeants who came to the force at a young age and were posted for duty on platforms practically knew nothing and learnt nothing. They ought to go through a regular course in Police Training Schools. The Police Training School at Moradabad trained Probationary Assistant Superintendents, Deputy Superintendents and Sub Inspectors and he saw no reason why it should not train sergeants as well. In the United Provinces constables were not trained at any special centre.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, thought that either there should be provided sufficient officers to train the men or the men should be deputed to special training schools.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, thought that there would be considerable advantage in having special classes for the training of railway police officers. The instruction should begin with head constables and should be confined to the investigating staff. These officers might be educated in the working of a station and the duties of assistant station masters, goods clerks, coaching clerks, etc.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, was of opinion that a Police Training School for railway police officers and men was essential and would yield excellent results. The school would give training in all branches of railway work. At the present moment he was trying to get the railway authorities to take his men and give them the necessary training. This practice had been in force for about a year, but very often the officers could not attend for months as they had to go on other duties. Matters which could also be taught at the special training school would be the routine observed at booking offices, parcel offices and goods sheds.

Inspector Farrant, suggested that there should be a special training school for railway police officers affiliated to the provincial training school, or that there should be a separate school for all India in which the entire working of the railway would be taught. There was a disadvantage in deputing officers to the railway as the railway authorities were rather chary of helping. On the other hand, if a railway man was borrowed for giving instruction in the training school, he would know that it was his business to give instructions and would do it.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi stated that a system of special training would give useful results. The general recruitment for the Railway Police should be from the District Police, but when officers were received on transfer, they should be given training in railway police duties in the reserve at the headquarters station as mentioned in his reply to question No. 26.

Sub-Inspector Pearey Shunker, thought that it would be very useful for investigating officers and subordinates to receive some elementary training in the system of working of the different branches of the railway. The training would be given by deputing the officer to some branch of a railway department.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz was of opinion that such a system would be useful.

Bombay.

No. No special training was considered necessary by the witnesses.

Madras.

None of the witnesses was in favour of any special training.

Bengal.

There is no special training for the Railway Police.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General of Police, and *Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah*, thought that the police required special training before they entered the Railway Police. This might be given at the Police Training School by selected police officers in the rudiments of train working, the methods of railway thieves, the methods of railway employees, powers under the Railway Act and various technicalities connected with railway police work which was quite different from district police work.

Mr. Ezechieel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, thought that experience was the only training possible.

Inspector Mukarji suggested that men who were recruited for the Railway Police should be given a probationary period during which they should see the working of the railway. He also suggested the same kind of training mentioned by Mr. Bradley, but added a course of signalling.

Inspector S. C. Damerji, thought improved working would result from a system combining both theoretical and practical training.

Assam.

There is no such system.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, would like to see responsible officers in the Railway Police receive some training in the technical branches, e.g., Traffic Department, Transshipment and Claims Branches, etc.

Inspectors Syed Husmatullah and U. C. Deb were of opinion that special training in railway working would be useful.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government stated that there was no system of special training for Railway Police officers and men, and referred to their reply to question No. 28.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent of Railway Police, Patna, stated that it would be advantageous if special training could be imparted (a) as regards missing goods cases, and (b) duties of the various staffs as regards running of trains, etc.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, was of opinion that practical experience at a railway police station should suffice.

Inspector Inder Sen Suchur, stated that it was very desirable that there should be some such system, vide his remarks under questions 28 and 29 (g).

Inspector Fauzdar Narain Kuar, stated that some special training was necessary but did not specify in what particulars.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Doughton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that there was no system of special training for railway police officers and men and he did not think that such a system was likely to give useful results except perhaps in instructing them specially in the system of working trains, signals, etc., which might help them in their enquiries into the causes of railway accidents. Much of this knowledge was picked up by officers in course of their work.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, considered that a training in railway technique would be of the greatest assistance.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, agreed.

Inspector Glackan, considered it necessary that Prosecuting Inspectors should be officers qualified in the working of signals, block instruments and railway rules.

Inspector Shurif Muhammad Khan, Sub-Inspectors Baijnath Kaula and Syed Maszar Naqi, thought that such a system of special training would give useful results.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, doubted whether anything was to be gained by any special system of training. Practical experience appeared to be all that was necessary.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that he intended to introduce his own system of special training which was under trial in the United Provinces. In 1917 Sir William Marris remarked that the training of the police was not satisfactory and requested him to go into the question. It was necessary in his opinion to raise the standard of police work by training sub-inspectors and head constables who had to take part in investigations. They were learning things by heart without understanding them. They could give answers the meanings of which they themselves did not understand. Sir William Marris was of opinion that it was useless to train the Police in that way and that instruction should be given by trained instructors. Some instructors were borrowed from the Education Department and a guide was prepared laying down what constables should learn and the training was cast on more or less kindergarten methods. Things were explained in a simple way and a simple answer was required. At the same time it was necessary that the men should be literate, that is to say, they should be able to read and write Hindi or Urdu. Difficulty was experienced with ignorant Gurkhas. A course of 12 months was sufficient for constables. The proportion of literate men in the Rajputana Railway Police was about the same as in the United Provinces. The standard of the police would not be improved unless the men were trained in a more systematic and direct way and they were made to understand things. The Manual contained no special provisions for the training of the Railway Police. Instructors were borrowed from the Director of Public Instruction for ordinary school training. The intention was that at the end of 5 years the Police would possess literate men.

Sind.

No.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali was of opinion that there should be a training school at the headquarters of the railway district where recruits should be taught elementary law (Police Catechism) and the Railway Act.

Punjab.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General, stated that all members of the railway police force went through a regular period of training first in the ordinary course and then through the Central Investigating Agency. Personally he was very keen about headquarter schools, regarding the curriculum for which he had recently written a note. He suggested that additional instruction should be imparted at headquarter schools, in railway forms and procedure for all ranks. The system could be extended to include a special course in railway training.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that railway police officers went through the ordinary police training at Phillaur and on return were put through a course in the Central Investigating Agency which included drill. The men during this course were attached to investigations. Constables unable to attend Phillaur were given instruction in elementary law and procedure in the Police Lines as recruits and subsequently attended "refresher" courses of a month's duration in the lines about every 18 months. Subject to the training of probationary sub-inspectors in traffic duties, *vide* question 28, he considered that the present system was satisfactory.

North-West Frontier Province.

No.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, was of opinion that the ordinary system of training for one month at headquarters of the district and the training imparted in the Police Training School at Phillaur coupled with training in traffic work as suggested was sufficient for railway police purposes. Experience was the best teacher.

Question No. 33.—Have you a special detective staff? If so, describe its organization? Do you consider this system likely to improve detection?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, stated that there was no special detective staff. He had given the matter a good deal of consideration and he would prefer a Railway Branch in the Criminal Investigation Department itself with sub-inspectors and inspectors with railway experience who could be employed on investigation of railway cases instead of a separate detective force for railway work.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, mentioned that all technical cases that were intricate required a whole-time man if they were to be sifted properly. A small staff of expert investigators was required at headquarters of Superintendents of Police, to deal with specially technical and intricate cases. A staff consisting of one inspector, two sub-inspectors and half a dozen good detective constables would probably suffice.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, thought that each Superintendent should have his own detective force consisting of two or more sub-inspectors and a dozen constables—at least for the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway. Sometime ago he had sent up proposals for such a staff but they had been rejected.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, said that a detective staff should form part of the Railway Police. The men should be at the disposal of the Superintendent, so that they could be sent out at once to take up cases involving an enquiry over several railways. In "C" Section there was only one sub-inspector per police station; he could not be sent away on special enquiries possibly involving journeys in Bombay or in Bengal.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, had found that the need for a Criminal Investigation Department staff was very great. A special detective staff might be attached to each section. They would be more easily obtainable under such a system than if they were a part of the Criminal Investigation Department.

Inspector Macleod was in favour of a special staff to form part of the Railway Police entirely separate from the Criminal Investigation Department.

Mr. Sharps, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that a detective force was essential. He had been receiving letters from the railway, asking him to make special enquiries, but had not been able to comply with their request as he had not got the staff. Formerly, it was possible to hand such cases over to the Criminal Investigation Department. Now they were very short-handed and they would not send their man unless it was really a special case. The Railway Police had to rely on their own men. He would prefer an

Imperial Investigation force to a provincial force. If the Railway Police were maintained on a provincial basis the Railway Criminal Investigation Department would also have to be on a provincial basis. The suggestion made in the Central Provinces that although it was essential that the Railway Police should be maintained on a provincial basis, yet there might be a Director-General of Railway Police with the Government of India who would have a staff of detective and investigating officers at his disposal whom he would depute to provinces for particular investigations just as the Criminal Investigation Department or the Director Intelligence Bureau did was not a bad idea provided that they were not different forces.

Prosecuting Inspector Khanat Nabi, Inspector Farrant, and Sub-Inspector Peary Shunker, were in favour of the appointment of a special detective staff.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz, suggested that a detective staff designated Criminal Investigation Department, Government Railway Police, consisting of three sub-inspectors, five head constables and seventeen constables should be placed at the headquarters of the Superintendent of Railway Police. Their duties would be to enquire into specially serious railway thefts or other important investigations.

Bombay.

No. All the witnesses were of opinion that a special detective staff was an essential part of the Railway Police organization and should be provided.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General, regarded a special detective staff as an essential part of Railway Police organization. There was no such staff at present, nor were facilities available to provide investigating officers with the special training that would be required to make such a staff really efficient.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, stated that at present ordinary plain clothes men who were given allowances were employed.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, was of opinion that such a staff was a primary essential for preventing loss at loading, unloading and transshipment yards.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that plain clothes men were deputed to watch looking windows. Criminals could not spot such men.

Inspector Bird was in favour of a force of detectives.

Madras.

No. Important cases are taken up by the Criminal Investigation Department.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, thought that such a force was unnecessary as the Criminal Investigation Department took up important cases. *Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General*, agreed.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, stated that Superintendents always had smart men who could be deputed for any special work while for really big cases there was the Criminal Investigation Department to draw upon.

Inspector Doraiswamy, seemed to favour the creation of such a force.

Bengal.

There is a special detective staff on the East Indian Railway which has been in existence for about two years. It is not yet a permanent force. It consists of 1 inspector, 4 sub-inspectors and 20 constables. There are special rules framed by the Inspector-General controlling the working of this Department. Important cases are made over to it for investigation which it follows to whatever part of India it leads.

There is a special detective staff on the Sealdah Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway consisting of 1 inspector, 4 sub-inspectors, 4 assistant sub-inspectors and 16 constables. The Department which was created early in 1919 has proved a success. There is also a special detective staff on the Saidpur Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway consisting of 1 inspector 5 sub-inspectors, 4 assistant sub-inspectors and 21 constables.

Rules for the working of Detective Department of the Railway Police.

1. *Rules to be of General Application*.—These rules shall apply to all Detective Departments of the Railway Police.

2. *Function of the Detective Department*.—The Detective Department is an investigating staff and not merely an advisory staff and shall investigate all cases of organized professional crime committed within the jurisdiction of the Railway Police made over to the Detective Department by the Superintendent.

Such cases shall ordinarily include important running train thefts from station yards, thefts from goods wagons and thefts of arms or any other case in which the Superintendent, Railway Police, considers the Detective Department can be usefully employed subject to the principles laid down in these rules.

3. *Selection of cases for investigation by the Detective Department*.—In selecting cases for investigation by the Detective Department the Superintendent, Railway Police shall be careful to avoid making over to the Detective Department more cases than the staff can reasonably be expected to investigate.

1. *Power of an Inspector of the Detective Department*.—As an Inspector is an officer superior in rank to an officer in charge of a police-station, he is empowered to investigate a case occurring anywhere within the Railway Police district to which he is attached.

5. *Sub-Inspector of the Detective Department to be posted temporarily to the Railway Police-Station within whose jurisdiction the case occurred.*—A sub-inspector not being an officer superior in rank to an officer in charge of a police-station has not this power. When, therefore, a sub-inspector or officer of lower rank of the Detective Department is employed to investigate a case, the Superintendent shall, by an order in writing, post the Sub-Inspector or officer of lower rank to the police station within whose jurisdiction the case occurred.

6. *Submission of Case Diaries.*—Officers of the Detective Department employed on the investigation of a case shall submit case diaries under the provisions of Section 172, Criminal Procedure Code.

7. *To whom Case Diaries are to be submitted and responsibility of the Detective Inspector for the investigation.*—The Case Diaries shall be submitted not to the circle officer but to the Detective Inspector placed in charge of the investigation by the Superintendent, and the Detective Inspector concerned shall be entirely responsible to the Superintendent for the proper supervision and control over the investigation.

8. *Responsibility for preventive measures and action under Sections 109 and 110, Criminal Procedure Code.*—The Detective Department is not concerned with preventive measures under the above sections. The responsibility for this rests with the circle and station officers. The detective staff shall not, therefore be employed on the collection of evidence for proceedings under Sections 109 and 110, Criminal Procedure Code.

9. *Duties of the Detective Department and Station Police in connection with Proceedings under Sections 109 and 110, Criminal Procedure Code.*—If during the investigation of a specific offence, the Detective Department is unable to obtain sufficient evidence to justify a charge sheet, but evidence for proceedings either under Section 109 or 110, Criminal Procedure Code, is available, the Detective Department shall make over the papers of the case to the Circle Inspector who shall thereafter be responsible that proper use is made of the material collected by the Detective Department.

10. *Responsibility of the Detective Department for passing on information to the Station Police.*—If in the course of the investigation of a case the Detective Department receive information regarding the formation of new gangs, absconders, visits of suspected persons or information regarding past occurrences or any important information regarding crime or criminals unconnected with the case under enquiry, they shall at once pass the information on to the Circle Inspector, who shall thereafter be responsible that proper use is made of the information.

11. *Note to be kept of important information passed on to the Station Police.*—A brief note of all such information shall be made in a register to be opened for the purpose in the Detective Department.

12. *Disposition List to be maintained by the Detective Inspector.*—The Detective Inspector shall submit each day to the Superintendent a brief note showing how each officer of the Department is employed.

13. *Officers not to be employed on duties other than those provided for in the Rules.*—The officers of the Detective Department are not to be regarded as a reserve of officers. They are on no account to be posted to police-stations as station officers to fill temporary vacancies or to be employed on miscellaneous duties or on any work other than those laid down in the rules.

14. *Transfer of officers from the Detective Department.*—No officer once appointed to the Detective Department shall be transferred from the Department without the sanction of the Inspector-General.

Misconduct or unsuitability for the work will be regarded as sufficient justification for the removal of an officer from the Department subject to the sanction of the Inspector-General. No Detective Department can become efficient if the officers are being constantly changed.

15. *Interviews in Jail.*—Interviewing convicts in jail for the purpose of obtaining information regarding a case under investigation must be regarded as one of the most important duties of the Detective Department.

16. *List of convicts interviewed in Jail.*—A list of convicts interviewed with the result should be maintained in the Detective Department.

17. *Information to be on record in the Detective Department.*—The Detective Department shall maintain such lists and notes connected with the following records as may be necessary or useful to the officers of the Department but the maintenance of the records and registers shall rest as usual with the Superintendent's office.

- (1) Gang register of railway thieves.
- (2) History sheets of gang members and notorious railway criminals.
- (3) Register of release notices.
- (4) Register of unidentified persons.
- (5) District crime map.

N.B.—The arrest of absconders is primarily the duty of the station police and this responsibility must be enforced but it is necessary for the Detective Department to study the list carefully, as in many instances absconders are responsible for the commission of much crime.

18. *Registers to be maintained in the Detective Department.*—The following registers shall be maintained in the Detective Department :—

- (1) Receipt and despatch book.
- (2) Confidential report book.
- (3) Card index of enquiry slips regarding foreign criminals.
- (4) Order book.
- (5) Disposition list showing daily how each officer is employed.
- (6) Card index of important absconders and notorious offenders wanted by the police.
- (7) Files of the Criminal Intelligence Gazette.
- (8) Files of personal diaries.

19. *Lists to be maintained in the Detective Department.*—Lists of the following should be maintained and kept up-to-date :—

- (a) List of notorious receivers of the bordering district.
- (b) List of important absconders in railway police cases.
- (c) List of important border criminals addicted to committing crime on the railways.
- (d) List of persons interviewed in jail.
- (e) List of stolen property in important railway cases.
- (f) List of important undetected cases in which professional criminals were suspected to be concerned.

N. B.—*Discrimination to be observed in preparing the lists.* In preparing these lists discrimination should be exercised so as to keep the lists within reasonable limits. Information is required only of important cases and names necessary for the Detective Department to be familiar with if they are to be properly equipped for their duties.

20. *Superintendent to examine Detective Department Officers.*—The Superintendent should frequently examine the officers of the Department and satisfy himself that all officers of the Department are familiar with the contents of these lists and registers.

21. *Duties of Head Constables.*—Head Constables of the Railway Detective Department shall not be employed to investigate cases but should be freely employed on shadowing suspects in a case, looking up registers, making enquiries regarding the presence or absence of persons suspected in a case under investigation or making other miscellaneous enquiries in connection with the case. If he is deputed to examine formal or unimportant witnesses he must submit a case diary.

22. *Co-operation between the Railway Detective Department and the District Police.*—The closest possible co-operation must be maintained between the Railway Police Detective Department and the District Police through whose jurisdiction the railway runs. District circle and station officers will be held strictly responsible that prompt assistance is rendered whenever asked for, and the district staff must unreservedly place at the disposal of the Railway Detective Department any information likely to be of assistance in the enquiry. All jealousy, friction and withholding of information must be strictly avoided. Any officer of the Railway Detective Department or of the district staff found guilty of refusal to co-operate, wilfully withholding information, causing friction or in any way obstructing the investigation, will be liable to instant dismissal. All instances of disobedience to this rule are at once to be reported to the Inspector-General through the Range Deputy Inspector-General.

23. *Co-operation with the Railway Staff.*—Officers of the Detective Department will use their utmost endeavours to maintain friendly relations with the railway station staffs treating them on all occasions with courtesy and consideration. Their assistance will be invaluable in the investigation of railway crime.

24. *Responsibility of the Inspector.*—The Inspector in charge of the Detective Department will be held responsible that rule 23 is strictly observed and that his staff treat the heads of the Railway Department with proper respect and it shall be the duty of the Inspector and his officers to pay their respects to and make the acquaintance of all heads of Executive Departments stationed at Howrah and Asansol or elsewhere on the line.

25. *Application for secret service money.*—Applications for secret service money for the Detective Department should be addressed by the Superintendent to the Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department. Grants should be on as liberal a scale as possible.

Assam.

There is no special detective staff.

The witnesses were of opinion that such a staff would improve detection.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, remarked that the results obtained by the Criminal Investigation Department were far better than those obtained by officers in the ordinary line which was principally due to their having no other duties. In the Railway Police it was not possible to spare men for any considerable period for any special deputation. A separate detective force of a few Sub-Inspectors with or without an Inspector might well be employed at each Railway head-quarters for the investigation of intricate cases.

Bihar and Orissa.

On the East Indian Railway the special detective staff consists of four sub-inspectors and ten constables. The staff was sanctioned in 1919, but owing to shortage of men it has not been possible to employ the force on the duties for which they were intended.

On the Bengal Nagpur Railway the sanctioned detective staff which consists of three sub-inspectors and ten head constables, has been in existence since 1915.

On the Bengal and North-Western Railway the sanctioned detective staff consists of two sub-inspectors and seven constables.

The force was formed to replace train patrols or guards and their primary duty is in regard to thefts from passenger trains, but they also deal with goods thefts, drugging, cheating, pocket-picking, waiting hall thefts, obstructions on the line and thefts of railway material. They do not as a rule investigate.

The Bihar and Orissa Government stated that the introduction of the system on the Bengal Nagpur Railway and the Bengal and North-Western Railway had up to date given no marked result. On the other hand, if specially selected officers and men were only employed and were given special training as indicated in their reply to question 28, the system would undoubtedly improve detection.

Mr. Macrae, Deputy Inspector-General, Crime and Railways, stated that the special detective staff was used mainly for detection. Investigation was done by the Criminal Investigation Department. Where a special officer was required the Criminal Investigation Department could do all the special investigation work that was required.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Kharagpur, did not consider that the organisation of a special detective staff under Imperial control would be satisfactory, but preferred a provincial staff, as an Imperial organization would mean loss of touch with the District Police. He did not approve of the suggestion of forming a Railway Police Director of Criminal Intelligence with a staff of detectives whom he might place at the disposal of the provincial administrations. It would be difficult for such staff to keep in touch with the District Police and further the Imperial staff would not get the same assistance from the local Railway Police as they would if they were members of their own Police. The local Police would look upon them entirely as outsiders with whom they had no concern. There would be a certain amount of jealousy, too, and there was danger in a force like that becoming subordinate to the railway administration, which was a thing to be guarded against. The men he had—three sub-inspectors and ten constables—were employed as train guards, etc., and were likely to be useful if well selected.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that to render the system effective specially selected and trained officers of the Criminal Investigation Department should be employed, who should have also received special training in the working of the railway, and possess intimate knowledge of inter-provincial criminals and railway thieves. The constables employed should also

have had special training. To make the Department popular, the usual Criminal Investigation Department allowances should be granted to the force. He had not seen any good work done by the existing force of two sub-inspectors and seven constables on the Bengal and North-Western Railway, but they worked directly under the Superintendent.

Inspector Fouzdar Narain Kuar considered that the system was likely to improve detection, but that the present strength was insufficient.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that each Railway Police Section had one Detective Inspector. The assistance he gave improved detection.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, stated that this officer had proved useful and the addition of an Indian Inspector to each Section or Division would improve detection and show better results.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, considered that the system might be extended.

Inspector Glackan thought that a staff consisting of inspectors, sub-inspectors, head constables and constables was likely to improve the detection of crime.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naqi and *Sub-Inspector Baignath Kaula* agreed with Inspector Glackan.

Detective Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan stated that he worked alone and had no staff. He did no inspection work but took up cases such as running train thefts from 1st and 2nd class passengers, cases in which men travelled with bogus warrant, etc. In 1920 he dealt with five or six cases, among them the Harda fraud case which took six months. In other provinces he got whatever assistance he required provided no responsibility attached to the officer who assisted him. Under his proposed system of having a Director-General of Railway Police each railway would have its own detective staff. For instance the Great Indian Peninsula railway which ran through four different provinces would have one staff for the whole railway and the four provinces.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that there was no such staff and he did not see any advantage therein.

Rajputana Police.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that there was no special detective staff, but five smart constables were employed to look out for pick-pockets and opium smugglers. He thought that it would be of advantage to have such a staff, but did not care for the idea of a Railway Criminal Investigation Department.

Sind:

No.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that a special staff was very necessary. He would make over to it cases in which there was dispute about jurisdiction and important cases which needed special men. He had experienced considerable difficulty due to the question of jurisdiction which arose in the following way: for instance, a wagon passing out of Kotri yard would be checked at Meting and there would be wrongly passed with seals intact; further on the seals would be found broken. The officer at Meting would start the enquiry and find that he had no reason to suspect that the theft was committed in his jurisdiction and would proceed to Kotri where he would find that the seals were actually defective, but that no action was taken by the staff there. At this point trouble ensued as to whether the occurrence took place at Kotri or not.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali agreed and stated that the duty of such a staff should be to see that the travelling constables did their work properly and to bring to the notice of the Superintendent, Railway Police, where offences had been committed jointly by the Traffic officers and menials and Railway Police and other valuable information.

Punjab.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General, stated that he was a great believer in a special detective staff. Police station house officers were always worried in their minds as to what was happening in their own police stations when they were out on tour but detective officers could follow up cases with no such uneasiness in their minds. The Central Investigating Agency was entirely free from that restriction. The detective staff should be a Provincial Agency, as India was far too big for an Imperial Agency. He thought that the general clearing houses which he recommended in reply to question 8 would be probably more efficient and manageable than any central agency for the whole of India.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that he had a Central Investigating Agency with an executive establishment of 3 inspectors, 4 sub-inspectors, 15 head constables and 50 foot constables. This force was directly under him and he had attached one of his

two inspectors to it in subordinate charge. All matters connected with crime were dealt with in the office of this agency which by means of analytical maps watched carefully the incidence of crime, issued proper instructions to local officers and devised measures for prevention and detection. It also detailed skilled officers to assist local officers in working out important cases, that is, organized or special forms of crime and difficult cases such as those with ramifications extending into two or more jurisdictions. It sent detectives to look out for pick-pockets, poisoners and other professional criminals and when crime became epidemic in any particular section of the line detailed a strong staff to tackle the situation. He had great hopes that his system would work well.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that if detectives were appointed and posted to work under the directions of station house officers and Sub-Divisional Officers, good results might be obtained.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir stated that the Central Investigation Agency was working well and there were great hopes of future improvement.

North-West Frontier Province.

No.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, was of opinion that there should be a special detective staff in each Railway Police District as recommended by him in reply to Question 29 (b). He would like to have a Criminal Investigating Agency like that in the Punjab and thought they would have as many as 50 cases a year to deal with in the North-West Frontier Province. The investigation of these cases would involve enquiries elsewhere. The assistance received from other provinces depended upon the officer concerned.

Question No. 34.—What are the arrangements in force for the prosecution of railway cases? Are they satisfactory?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, did not think that the arrangements in force for the prosecution of railway cases were very satisfactory, but it was very hard to devise any other system which would be more satisfactory as long as cases were not tried by a separate Railway Magistrate. He had come to the conclusion that it would be more satisfactory to increase the number of Railway Prosecuting Sub-Inspectors and to place them in centres where they would be called upon to do more prosecuting work. Prosecuting Sub-Inspectors were employed in A and C Sections but not in B Section. He would be inclined to abolish Prosecuting Inspectors for the Railway Police and increase the number of Prosecuting Sub-Inspectors. With Assistant Superintendents as sub-divisional Railway Police officers he would attach a Prosecuting Sub-Inspector to each sub-division.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, thought that the arrangements were on the whole satisfactory, but the staff might be strengthened. He preferred a Prosecuting Inspector with a small staff of Sub-Inspectors. A great many railway cases were intricate and in practice a man with experience was wanted. A Sub-Inspector with a little training could do the ordinary prosecuting work but for technical cases an experienced man was required.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, thought that the arrangements were satisfactory.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that the District Police Prosecutor helped the Railway Police in the prosecution of their cases.

Inspector Macleod thought the present arrangements satisfactory.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that each railway police section had a prosecuting inspector. He advocated the addition of a Prosecuting Sub-Inspector in his section as there was work for him and it did not infrequently happen that cases went unrepresented owing to want of another officer. The District Police Prosecuting Inspector had very little time to devote to railway cases. He did not understand the railway point of view and the difficulties that had to be contended with involving technical points, and had little interest in them. The Court Mohurrir in the Railway Magistrate's Court should not belong to the District Police, but should be provided by the Railway Police.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi suggested that there should be at least two Prosecuting Sub-Inspectors in each section in addition to the Prosecuting Inspector and agreed with Mr. Sharpe's remarks regarding the Railway Magistrate's Court Mohurrir.

Inspector Farran stated that the system was not satisfactory. The Prosecuting Inspector attached to each section only prosecuted such cases as he thought necessary, or was ordered by the Superintendents to take up. If the Prosecuting Inspector did not attend, the District Prosecuting Sub-Inspector was responsible for the prosecution of the case.

Inspector Pearcey Shanker stated that the existing arrangements were very unsatisfactory and proposed that there should be one Prosecuting Sub-Inspector at the headquarters of each division.

Sub-Inspector Abdul Aziz stated that the prosecution of cases was a very important factor in the whole situation and recommended that there should be one Prosecuting Inspector or Sub-Inspector for the railway police cases in each division. The present arrangements were not at all satisfactory. The Prosecuting Inspector only attended important cases; otherwise the railway police cases remained at the mercy of the District Police Prosecuting Inspector who attended to them if he got time from his own district cases. If he were unable to spare the time they remained unrepresented.

Bombay.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General, stated that there was a special staff of Prosecuting Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors who were as a rule graduates in law or qualified High Court Pleaders. The staff was composed of 1 Inspector and 2 Sub-Inspectors for the Great Indian Peninsula and Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways and 1 Inspector and 1 Sub-Inspector for the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway. As a rule only difficult or important cases were handled by the officers of the prosecuting staff.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, considered the present arrangements satisfactory but thought that a separate Prosecutor for Bombay was now desirable.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, thought the present arrangements satisfactory. Rule 785 of the Bombay District Police Manual which directed that the Railway Company's solicitor should conduct the prosecution of offenders against the railway laws was no longer adhered to. The prosecution on such cases was conducted by police officers.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, stated that owing to the great increase in work due to the increase in crime prosecuting officers found it difficult to attend to all cases in which their services were required. Bombay required a special prosecuting officer to deal with cases sent for trial to the Presidency Magistrate's Court and the Coroner's Court.

Sub-Inspector Rege considered that the present staff was inadequate and stated that Bombay required a special officer.

Madras.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General of Police, was of opinion that there ought to be more prosecuting officers. Four or five officers were wanted in place of the two now working.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, stated that there was a separate prosecuting staff of 1 Inspector and 1 Sub-Inspector. The number of Sub-Inspectors might be increased to two, otherwise the arrangements were satisfactory.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, was of opinion that the arrangements in force were satisfactory.

Inspector Doraiswamy agreed.

Bengal.

In the outlying districts all the prosecuting work is done by the District Police prosecuting staff, but in Calcutta there are special prosecuting officers at Howrah and Sealdah. The Railway Superintendents were of opinion that the District Court prosecuting staff did not pay as much attention to their railway cases as they paid to district cases.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General, was of opinion that this argument no longer held good now that both the Railway and District Police were under the Range Deputy Inspector-General.

Inspector D. N. Mukherjee stated that there was a prosecuting Inspector and a Sub-Inspector at Howrah. There should be also a special prosecuting officer at Asansol.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, stated that the Sealdah Court Inspector was originally intended for the prosecution of important railway cases all over his jurisdiction but his work in the Sealdah Court was so heavy that he could not get away. Another Inspector was required.

Inspector S. C. Banerjee, of the Saidpur Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway, stated that in place of the present Sub-Inspector a force of 1 Inspector, 2 Sub-Inspectors and 1 Assistant Sub-Inspector was required for the Saidpur Section.

Assam.

There is one Sub-Inspector sanctioned for prosecuting railway cases. He has to attend 21 different Courts and at times has to prosecute two or more important cases in different Courts at the same time.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, recommended the sanction of three more prosecuting officers to be attached to each Inspector's Circle. He was of opinion that a railway police officer experienced in prosecuting railway cases was more useful and more likely to be successful than a District Court Sub-Inspector who knew little or nothing of railway work, rules and practice.

The Assam Government was of opinion that the employment of a pleader by the Deputy Commissioner would probably be a better arrangement than an addition to the prosecuting staff.

Inspector Hashmatullah supported Mr. Giles' recommendation.

Mr. Giles further suggested that a separate Magistrate was required for railway cases as the ordinary Magistrate had too much other work. This Magistrate should be located at some central spot.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government stated that Railway Police cases were ordinarily prosecuted by District Police Court Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors. In addition, and for the more intricate cases, a Prosecuting Inspector was sanctioned for the East Indian Railway Police, but as in practice, it was found practically impossible for one officer to devote much attention to the prosecution of railway cases in Courts scattered through the entire system, the appointment was to be replaced by the provision of three Prosecuting Sub-Inspectors, one for each division of the railway. With the provision of those officers it would be possible to provide for expert assistance to the district prosecuting staff in Railway Police cases, and in the more important cases the Railway Police prosecuting officer would be able to devote reasonable time and attention to the prosecution in Courts. The Bengal-Nagpur Railway and the Bengal and North-Western Railway had each been provided with a Prosecuting Inspector for similar duties. Should the change on the East Indian Railway prove successful in practice similar changes would probably be made on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway and the Bengal and North-Western Railway. With the provision of a technical prosecuting staff on the lines indicated above, to assist the district staff and concentrate attention on the more important cases, the arrangement for the prosecution of the railway cases would be satisfactory.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, stated that the present system under which the railway cases were conducted by the Prosecuting Officer of the Court in which they were tried was most unsatisfactory.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar described prosecutions as the weakest spot in the whole Railway Police administration. District Prosecuting Officers took little interest in railway cases. The Prosecuting Inspector sanctioned for the Bengal and North-Western Railway District would be of little use as he would only be able to look after one important case at a time.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that each Railway Police Section had a Prosecuting Inspector. The work was done by Prosecuting Inspectors of the District Police, except in special and technical cases. This arrangement was not satisfactory. The only possible solution for improving matters was by increasing the number of Railway Prosecutors but he was doubtful whether the work justified the existence of one in every district.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, thought that a better arrangement would be to have all railway cases taken up by the railway prosecuting staff. A touring Railway Magistrate would also be a great advantage.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, and *Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan* stated that the District Police Prosecuting Inspectors did not give the same attention to railway cases as to their own.

Inspector Glackan agreed and stated that an additional staff of at least two Railway Prosecuting Sub-Inspectors would make matters more satisfactory.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Naji considered the arrangements satisfactory.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kuula did not agree but gave no reasons.

Hyderabad.

The Railway Police conduct the prosecution of all railway cases whether cognizable or non-cognizable. Complaints are taken from railway officials and all the subsequent proceedings are taken in hand by the Railway Police. Cases are tried *in situ* when the presence of many of the Company's servants from any station is necessary.

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, was of opinion that a Railway Travelling Magistrate was a desideratum.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the majority of cases in the jurisdiction of the Rajputana Railway Police were tried by the one Railway Magistrate, hence the Police Prosecuting Inspector was not at the disadvantage he often laboured under in the United Provinces system. He had found it a great convenience to have a special Railway Magistrate, but pointed out that it was rendered necessary by the peculiar circumstances of the Rajputana lines, as the Magistrates in Native States had no jurisdiction on the railways.

Sind.

There is one Police Prosecuting Inspector for the Sind Railways.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, was of opinion that the system was satisfactory, but two Sub-Inspectors instead of one were required to assist the Inspector.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali was of opinion that the system was satisfactory.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that a Court Inspector was attached to the Central Investigation Agency and supervised the preparation of cases for trial. A touring Court Inspector prosecuted important cases away from headquarters and the remaining cases were prosecuted in Courts by the prosecuting staffs of the civil districts concerned. These arrangements were satisfactory.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that there was only one Court Inspector for the whole of the Punjab Railway Police, who could not cope with the whole prosecution work of the province. Hence station house officers of the Railway Police helped District Court Inspectors in the prosecution of railway cases. The practice was satisfactory.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir agreed with *Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim*.

North-West Frontier Province.

There are no special arrangements in force for the prosecution of railway cases which devolves on the prosecuting staff of the District Police in each district.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that the system had not worked satisfactorily. The District Police Prosecuting staff had not the time to devote to Railway Police cases and did not understand technical railway cases involving the examination of railway records and railway methods of working. In important cases of this nature he always deputed a Railway Police officer to assist in the prosecution. There should be a separate Prosecuting Sub-Inspector for the Railway Police. Railway cases were considered unimportant. He had known cases fail for want of proper prosecution.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, considered that one Prosecuting Sub-Inspector for the Railway Police was sufficient.

Question No. 35.—The Railway Police are at present organized on a provincial basis. Would any other system of organization in your opinion be an improvement on this, e.g., (a) imperialization, (b) an organization which would take the railway system as the unit and make the Superintendent of Police for most purposes the head of a Railway Department, (c) a system under which the Railway Police were amalgamated with the District Police.

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General of Police, was of opinion that the organization must be on the provincial basis.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, thought that of the three suggestions advanced for improved organization of the Railway Police—and that improvement was necessary would hardly be seriously contested—suggestion (b) offered the best chance of success. He did not favour pure imperialization, as considerations of language and divorce from close co-operation with District Police administration appeared to militate against any possible advantage which might be secured by such a reform. The subordinate police whether in the railway or in the districts must remain a provincial organization and therefore pure imperialization was impracticable. He did not consider that it would be advisable to amalgamate the Railway Police with the District Police. It would mean splitting up the Railway Administration into innumerable water-tight compartments, far more so even than under the existing organization and any existing continuity of investigation would entirely disappear. One of the chief causes of complaint against the present organization was this very division of charges and the consequent absence of any continuity over a particular railway system. This would be multiplied a hundredfold if amalgamation with the District Police were to be adopted. A further argument against the suggestion was that the Superintendent of the District Police was so overburdened with criminal and political work that he would never have the time to devote attention to Railway Police work. This objection could not be met by giving him an additional Assistant for Railway Police work. His responsibility would remain and the result of any such amalgamation would inevitably be decreased efficiency in all branches of police work. There only remained suggestion (b) as the only possible alternative to the existing system. He had studied *Mr. Ross' notes on the re-organization of the Government Railway Police*

and agreed generally that the proposal offered a reasonable prospect of improved working. The Railway Police undoubtedly suffered at the present time from the disadvantage of having no representative with the Government of India. As a result essential matters such as expansion of the force due to growth of the railways were turned down because they were handled by provincial Inspectors-General who naturally enough viewed such demands from a purely departmental attitude and were strictly limited by considerations of the increased expenditure on Police as a provincial entity. An Inspector-General of Railway Police in touch with the Government of India would at any rate not be hampered by such considerations and as an expert in his own line would stand a reasonable chance of putting through such proposals. In other matters connected with the administration of the Railway Police he would be an expert adviser to the Railway Board for fulfilling similar functions to those discharged by the Inspector-General of Forests. He would be responsible for seeing that Government Railway Police work was co-ordinated throughout India, but would not interfere with matters of internal administration between Deputy Inspectors-General of Railway Police Circles and Provincial Inspectors-General. If Deputy Inspectors-General of Railway Police Circles were placed in the same relation-ship to Provincial Inspectors-General as Range Deputy Inspectors-General were, he did not think there would be any cause for friction. As regards the administration of the Government Railway Police over a particular railway system, he thought Mr. Ross' scheme would certainly effect continuity of criminal administration, the absence of which was the chief difficulty in the present system. If simultaneously a general Railway Police Manual were to be introduced to secure uniformity of working and measures adopted to improve the supervising staff (*i. e.*, Divisional Inspectors) and the training of the rank and file, he was convinced that a vast advance would be secured in Railway Police efficiency.

Mr. Acock, Superintendent of Police, was of opinion that the real cause of the present unsatisfactory state of affairs was the failure of the railway authorities to enforce responsibilities on subordinate railway officials in the matter of thefts and pilferages and this might be traced to the terms of the Risk notes. They were so much in favour of the railway and so little in that of the public that an examination would show that the railways had to pay a small portion only of the actual amount of merchandise stolen or pilfered. The only railway officer who got really agitated was the head of the Claims Department when thefts became heavy. Other Departments—Traffic, Locomotive, Engineering all treated crime with perfect equanimity. Gazetted railway officers did not ordinarily obstruct the Government Railway Police in their efforts to prevent and detect crime, but the ordinary railway officers showed no enthusiasm in this respect. There was an immense inertia to be overcome and the Government Railway Police had to prove their case up to the hilt before the ordinary railway officer would move and sometimes more than prove it. This reacted on the whole organization. Until the ordinary railway man was made to realize that his own officers were determined to put down crime at all costs there was no hope of an improvement, however much the Government Railway Police might be improved and strengthened. Railway officers had told him that they preferred to pay claims rather than to have the Police interfering in the goods sheds. It was well-known and was admitted that in India it was exceedingly difficult for the Police (1) first to work out cases, (2) secondly to prosecute them successfully without *dabao*. In the railway the Government Railway Police had little or no *dabao* and therefore had the greatest difficulty in getting evidence and getting the witnesses to stick to their statements. In the case of thefts from parcels, thefts from wagons in the yards, thefts from goods sheds in which the railway men were concerned it was impossible to get evidence except of railway men who, even if willing to give it, were very susceptible to pressure from interested parties. If crime was heavy the blame was put on the Government Railway Police. For these reasons he thought that the present system was unworkable and considered that on some selected railway the Police should be made a Railway Department from the Superintendent downwards as an experiment. If that were done the railway would itself be responsible and railway officers would have to decide whether to support their Police or the dishonest Station Master who made more in a month than his District Traffic Superintendent. Mr. Ross' system was an excellent one, but the language difficulty would have to be disposed of. An Imperial head was most important at the present moment. The Superintendent had no friends at all. If the charge were too big for one man, two Inspectors-General might be appointed. But in his opinion the Imperial Inspector-General could only deal with general problems, for instance, whether an increase in staff was necessary. It would be his business to move Government in the matter.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, thought that Mr. Ross' scheme was an improvement on the present system. It might be merely shifting the points of friction but there would not be so many points and there would not be so many long arguments about place of registration of a case between the Railway Police of different provinces, as directly a dispute arose it would be handed up to the Inspector-General of Railway Police who, with his professional knowledge, would see at once which officer was in the wrong and deal with the matter severely. At present absurd arguments against accepting a case were sometimes raised, as officers knew that there was no central authority to decide between the claims of the two provinces. What was wanted was some senior officer to take over Railway Police work and make it uniform all over India and to represent matters connected therewith to the Government of India in the Railway Department.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, stated that he was in favour of Imperialization. He did not think that Imperialization would kill co-operation between the Railway Police and the District Police. It was a fact that for the purpose of Railway Police work, the co-operation of the District Police was more important than the co-operation of the Police in other provinces, but if he thought that Imperialization would prejudice the chances of co-operation between the District Police and the Railway Police, he would not recommend it.

Prosecuting Inspector Khairat Nabi was in favour of Imperialization in view of the special features of Railway Police work. Each railway, whether covering one province or more, should have one or more Superintendent, as the requirements of the case demanded.

Inspector Farrant was in favour of Imperialization, as at present, under the provincial system, the Railway Police experienced a certain amount of difficulty in dealing with other provinces. Enquiries at times led them into other provinces and they never got any assistance there. If the Railway Police were imperialized, they would have one head over the whole force who would be able to secure co-operation between the different provinces. At present there was practically no co-operation between the District Police and the Railway Police and he did not think that matters would be worse if the Railway Police were imperialized. Further, the Deputy Inspector-General for Railways would be in touch with the provincial Inspectors-General, and at any rate as much co-operation as was being received now would be obtained under the proposed scheme.

Sub-Inspectors Abdul Aziz and Pearey Shunker were in favour of Imperialization.

Bombay.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General of Police, said in his written evidence that there were four systems of general organization contemplated in the question: (1) Provincial, (2) Imperial, (3) Railway Departmental, and (4) District by district. Organisation under (4) would produce chaos. No. (3) was not suited to the condition of the country. It was largely the prestige attached to a Government servant that enabled the police to discharge their duty. The official position that State employ gave would be entirely absent in the Railway service. He doubted whether the high officers in the Railway Department were prepared to undertake the multifarious duties that devolved upon the higher supervisory officers of the Police Department. The choice was mainly between the Imperial and Provincial control. He could see little advantage in the Imperial system except for uniformity of practice in certain matters. It was quite certain that Provincial Governments would refuse to pay for any Police organization that they did not directly control and administer. Imperial control meant Imperial debit. With the Railway Police controlled by the Government of India and paid from Imperial sources the District Police would lose all incentive to co-operation and the Railway Police would lose the assistance without which they could not work successfully. The necessary degree of co-operation could be ensured only if the Railway Police were organized on a provincial basis under the control of the provincial Inspector-General who was also the head of the District Police. In his view any half and half system such as that in which the Railway Police would be organized provincially but controlled imperially did not represent practical politics. With the provincial system much could be done in the direction of uniformity by conferences and informal meetings of controlling officers.

In his oral evidence he said that what was really wanted was a Director-General of Crimes and Intelligence for the whole of India. There should be a central bureau of crimes and information which would have no executive authority. It might have a number of expert detectives on its staff who would be available to go anywhere they were required and to advise local officers when any special form of crime took place, but its main function would be to obtain and systematize information.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, thought that the provincial organization was the only possible one. He did not think one Police Manual for the whole of India would be possible because the local conditions were so different. The imperial officer, however, suggested below might lay down uniform rules after experience had been gained. The efforts of the different Railway Police in different provinces required co-ordination. For instance, there was no uniform system in connection with surveillance of suspects from one province to another. Also the systems of registration of offences by the Railway and District Police differed in the various provinces. He proposed a Director of Railway Police for the whole of India located at Simla. His duties would be to co-ordinate systems in different provinces and collect and disseminate information having particular reference to Railway Police work. There should be a separate Deputy Inspector-General for Railways in Bombay because there was too much work for the Range Deputy Inspectors-General. He had 9 Ranges and 12 Railways to control.

In his written evidence he said that the only improvement he could suggest was the appointment of a Director of Railway Police for the whole of India. Such a Director would ensure uniformity of methods. He would also be responsible for the collection and dissemination of information. He would not interfere in the internal economy of the force.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India, was not in favour of any other system except the provincial one. He proposed a provincial Deputy Inspector-General of Railway Police.

Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent of Police, said that the provincial system was the most satisfactory. If the force were imperialized difficulties would arise over the transfer of men and over the question of language. There might be an Inspector-General or Director for the Railway Police of India.

Sub-Inspector Rege did not think there would be any improvement.

Inspector Garside, on special duty with the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway as Watch and Ward Inspector at Ahmedabad, suggested a separate police force for each railway system. If the Police formed a Railway Department, there would be friction, because the interests of the Police and the Railway were opposed to one another. For instance, if the Railway Police Inspector investigating a case found that the theft was committed by a pointsman and wanted to prosecute the man and having done so to ensure that the man did not return to the station, the Station Master would shield that man by every means in his power, not because he was a good thief, but because he was a good pointsman.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, retired Inspector of Police, would imperialize like the Railway Mail Service.

Mr. Guider, formerly Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Bombay Presidency, and now Watch and Ward Superintendent, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, stated that imperialization would not be productive of any apparent advantage. On the other hand its adoption would have a tendency to impair the efficiency of the Railway Police, unless the staff remained permanently attached to one particular line throughout the entire period of their service. Such an arrangement might suit the rank and file but would not be approved by the superior staff of Sub-Inspectors or Inspectors, Deputy Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents or Superintendents. The question to be considered under such a scheme was that the officers should have hopes of promotion. Once they came to the railway they should not have to look to the province for promotion. If Mr. Ross's suggestion were given effect to, namely, that large trunk lines like the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, the East Indian Railway, Bengal-Nagpur Railway, North-Western Railway, etc., should have a Deputy Inspector-General for each with two Superintendents, so that there would be about 6 Deputy Inspectors-General and about 12 to 14 Superintendents, the service would be sufficiently attractive. If, however, smaller railways were allowed to remain as they were at present, there would be no improvement. The Range Deputy Inspector-General would not take any interest in railway work. At present he only took an academic interest in railway cases. He was speaking as an experienced officer who knew the actual state of affairs. On practical grounds, however, he did not think that the proposed scheme of imperialization would lead to any better results. Under the provincial organization if there was any friction between the Railway and the District Police, the local Inspector-General was in a better position to control them both. He doubted if the suggested scheme would secure more co-operation. With one officer controlling both Railways and Districts, he would be able to say that a particular thing must be done and could compel co-operation. With regard to the suggestion that there was room for an imperial agency of some sort in connection with railways, *i.e.*, an official like the Director, Intelligence Bureau, who would have no control but who would collect, sift and circulate information and could, if necessary, supply officers in certain complicated cases, he did not think the idea was a practical one. Such an agency would be useful where the railways wanted its assistance, otherwise the men would be idle for the rest of their time. There would be no use in collecting information unless it could be utilized promptly; at any rate, unless he knew something more of the details of the working and organization of the proposed Director's office, he did not think the suggestion of much practical value. He doubted if there was any need to have a separate investigating agency in the Railway Police. There should be a reserve staff of Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors to take up special railway cases. Taking the discussion as a whole, although he recognized that there were some advantages in imperialization, he was in favour of adhering to the present system with the exception of having a separate Deputy Inspector-General in charge of railways in each province. The provincial system would give better results than an imperial system as far as co-operation was concerned. A great deal depended on the Railway Police officer himself. If he was not getting satisfactory work from the District Police, it was for him to represent his case to the Inspector-General and go on representing until satisfaction was obtained. There was also an advantage under the provincial system that officers of the Railway Police were also acquainted with officers of the District Police and there was scope for cultivating a real spirit of friendship and familiarity. Superintendents should try to encourage and insist upon their subordinates cultivating co-operation. They should make a practice of meeting their officers occasionally. Such an arrangement would go a long way towards facilitating work on both sides. The District Police had no interest in railway cases and the railway were seldom called upon to assist the District Police. It was all a sort of giving and no taking business. Unless the relationship between the subordinate staff in both forces was improved, matters would continue as bad as ever. By maintaining the system a provincial one the chances were more in favour of securing co-operation owing to the acquaintance that existed between officers of the same province. They served together in the same province, they saw each other and met and talked to each other frequently, so that there should be no lack of co-operation, whereas if the service were not provincial, its men would be looked upon as strangers and the provincial men would not so readily come forward to help.

Madras.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General of Police, was opposed to the idea of imperialization. He stated that the question of divided responsibility would have to be faced. If there was a separate organization of the Railway Police working under Imperial control it would have nothing to do with the Government of Madras. He did not know what would happen in a case where the co-operation of the District Police was found necessary in such a scheme. The two forces would have a separate scale of pay and separate terms of enlistment. There would no longer be any interchange between the District and the Railway Police which he considered very necessary at times. Railway crime was almost entirely District crime. The present system had worked well in Madras. There was no need for a separate Deputy Inspector-General of Railways in Madras. Railway Police work was a light matter and the Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, could easily find time for both Railways and Criminal Investigation Department. There were on an average only 700 crimes a year and if dacoity, murder and robbery which did not belong to the Railway Police were subtracted crime was negligible. There might be an organization for groups of railways, e. g., for Bombay and Madras, for dealing with long distance cases.

Mr. Hannyngton, Deputy Inspector-General of the Criminal Investigation Department, did not think that imperialization would work well. Regarding (b) he thought that this was even a worse arrangement as the Police Officer would then be under the Agent who was not a Police Officer but the head of a Company. To revert to (c) would be going back to 20 years and the adoption of a system which had been rejected as unsatisfactory.

Mr. Windle, Superintendent, Railway Police, Trichinopoly, thought that as far as the South Indian Railway was concerned it was advisable that the Railway Police organisation should coincide with the railway system. He was entirely opposed to the amalgamation of the Railway Police with the District Police. He had no objection to the adoption of a uniform Police Manual for Railway Police work in India. He had never had trouble with foreign railways or junctions.

Inspector Doraiswamy was of opinion that imperialization was worth trying. He thought that the Police of each province would co-operate more heartily than they did now. At present there was difficulty in getting prompt replies from other provinces.

Bengal.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General of Police, said that he preferred to have an enlarged special Detective Staff rather than any form of imperialization because of the two railways with which the Bengal Police were concerned, the Eastern Bengal Railway was entirely under the Bengal Police and only a small portion of the East Indian Railway was in Bengal, so there was only one provincial boundary. He thought that by adopting imperialization there would be no co-operation between the Railway Police and the District Police as the two forces would be under two masters. Even if there were a Superintendent for each Railway with an Assistant Superintendent under him working entirely within a particular province the Superintendent of Police of the District would be a provincial man and the Superintendent of Police of the Railway Police would be an Imperial man. The District Police officers would be disinclined to co-operate with the Railway Police officers. The Imperial Inspector-General of Railways would have no control over the District Police. According to the present system the promotions were all on one cadre. The Deputy Inspector-General could stop the promotion of the District Police Sub-Inspector as well as that of the Railway Police Sub-Inspector. There were many cases in which Bengal Police officers had gone as far as Bombay but none had ever mentioned that they had experienced any difficulty in getting the assistance of the local police. If the Railway Police were amalgamated with the District Police the police station would either have to be on the railway or close to a railway station and the jurisdiction of *thanas* would have to be revised. He had found that it was the general experience of police officers on the railway that a great deal of time was taken up in replying to railway officers about cases. The District Superintendent of Police could not possibly spare the time for that and the railway would at once become discontented and say that the Superintendent of Police was paying no attention to railway cases. He thought that a certain amount of good would be obtained by ordering that all running train thefts should be registered both in the local *thana* and in the railway *thana* so as to give the District Police some interest in the working out of a case once it was localised. He did not appreciate any system in which the Superintendent of Police would become for all intents and purposes the head of a Railway Department and he did not think that any Superintendent of Police in Bengal would work under these conditions. It would mean that the Railway Police Superintendent would be under the Agent for all purposes except for discipline in which case he would be under an Imperial Inspector-General at Simla. The same difficulties about co-operation between the Railway Police and the District Police would still remain.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, thought that the provincial system was preferable to the imperial. (b) and (c) were impracticable. The Range Deputy Inspector-General was not only an inspecting officer but co-ordinated the work of the Railway and the District Police and it would be a great loss if his control were removed. District Superintendents would not give the same assistance without his supervision. Asked how it would do to

appoint a Superintendent for each railway system with Assistants working under him within provincial limits he was of opinion that the authority of the Assistant Superintendent would not be sufficient. If the Railway Police became a department of the railway there was a risk that the Railway would try to make the Police do things which they should not do, *i.e.*, to take up non-cognizable cases, etc.;—they might try to make use of the police report as a reason for not paying claims.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Sealdah, was of opinion that none of the three systems suggested would work. Existing arrangements could not be improved except possibly by putting all the Railway Police in one province under one Deputy Inspector-General. Railway work was not neglected by the Range Deputy Inspector-General but the Railway Police was looked upon as a sort of seventh wife. Districts got preference. The Railway Police was the dumping ground for all men who do not do good work in the districts. With a separate Deputy Inspector-General, the Railway Police would no longer be a dumping ground.

Mr. Farmer, Superintendent of Police, 24-Parganas, stated that professional railway thieves were themselves imperialized. They did not require local knowledge like the ordinary burglar but could carry on their trade on any train, and when one place became worked out or too hot for them they moved on to fresh ground. For this reason an imperialized police detective force seemed necessary to cope with this class of criminals. On the other hand an imperialized Railway Police force would be still more indifferent to the requirements of the District Police than were the present Railway Police. As it was, the Railway Police did not co-operate with the District Police in preventing crime. It would be a mistake to make the Superintendent of Railway Police the head of the Railway Department as the railway employees were to a very large extent responsible for much of the petty crime and pilferages and if too closely associated with the Railway Administration, the Superintendent of Police would find it very difficult to check this form of crime if it interfered with railway interests in obtaining labour, etc. Moreover this would lead to less co-operation with the District Police. He was in favour of amalgamating the Railway Police with the District Police with this reservation that there should be a strong Imperial Detective Staff which would automatically take up the investigation of all running train thefts and missing goods cases. The officers of this staff would have to be specially trained to be cognizant with the leading train thieves of every province. Ordinary crimes such as thefts and burglaries in station godowns and coolies' quarters should be investigated by the officer in charge of the district police station concerned. Assistant Sub-Inspectors should be kept at existing railway police stations to record information and to hand it on either to the local police station or to the detective staff. Constables for patrolling work at stations should be supplied from local police stations the staff of which would have to be strengthened accordingly. As regards constables travelling on running trains a specially trained staff was required for this purpose of district constables whose training would include their being taught to identify the bad characters on the stretch of line to which they would be deputed. In addition to these men the special detective staff should have constables deputed to travel in trains to look out for railway train thieves.

Mr. Cook, District Magistrate, Midnapur, would amalgamate the Railway Police with the District Police. Most of the crime was running train theft and theft from yards. All the stolen property went into the District Police jurisdiction. Railway Police officers had no authority in the district. There was the enquiry slip system but it was not so effective as having both forces under one head. There would not be any less co-operation between the Railway and the amalgamated Police force. He never saw the Superintendent of Railway Police except at the Club. The present system led the Railway Police to look upon themselves as a separate force. Imperialization would lead the Railway Police to look on themselves as a superior body which would not tend to co-operation. He did not recommend the transference of the Khargpur section of the Bengal-Nagpur Railway to the Bengal Police, although the District Magistrate would take more interest in railway crime but for the feeling that he was "butting in" which was strong where the Railway Police were under another Government.

Mr. Prentice, District Magistrate, 24-Parganas, supported Mr. Farmer but would have a Sub-Inspector as the officer who would decide whether a case should be taken up by Railway Police or District Police. All cases of theft of railway property should go to the District Police.

Inspector S. C. Banerjee of the Saidpur Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway said that at present the Inspector-General could not spare the time to look into the working of the Railway Police but an Imperial Inspector-General would be able to do so. The co-operation of the District Police would not be lost by such an arrangement.

Assam.

The Assam Government mentioned that at present the organization was on the basis of the railway system. They considered that the Assam Bengal Railway south of the Meghna should be handed over to Bengal. In Dacca and Mymensingh Districts three police forces were at present employed (1) Assam Railway Police on Assam-Bengal Railway, (2) Bengal Railway Police on Eastern Bengal Railway, (3) Bengal District Police.

Mr. Dundas, Inspector-General of Police, stated that the Police Commission recommended that the boundaries of the Railway Police and the province should be coterminous, but they made two exceptions one of which was that the Assam Bengal Railway should be under Assam,

This arrangement had been found quite convenient except in policing two small branch lines which lay north of Dacca and Mymensingh. In this area there were three sets of Police. Government had informed him that they would like these two branch lines north of the Meghna to be taken over by Bengal, but the Chief Commissioner was quite prepared to consider the larger question of having the organization on a provincial basis, i. e., that Assam should take over the Assam-Bengal Railway from Harishpur and also take over the Eastern-Bengal Railway in Goalpara District. He thought that it would be better to leave the Eastern Bengal Railway to Bengal and for the Assam Government to take over the Assam-Bengal Railway except the portions named above. It might be more logical that as practically the whole of the Eastern Bengal Railway was in Bengal Districts that the police officer in charge of the Assam-Bengal Railway should be a Bengal officer rather than an Assam officer. The Criminal Investigation Department had not received much assistance from the Railway Police in spite of the fact that that was one of the points on which the Police Commission based their recommendation that the Criminal Investigation Department and Railways should be run by the same Deputy Inspector-General.

Mr. Halliday, Superintendent of the Criminal Investigation Department, stated that he had secured assistance from the Railway Police whenever he had asked for it, but it was not necessary for the two departments to be under the same head in Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, mentioned that none of the three systems suggested would be quite satisfactory. Imperialization had disadvantages which it would be difficult to overcome, one of the most important being the language question. He would like the railway system to be the unit. For police purposes the whole of the main line from Chittagong to Tinsukia with all its branch lines (except the Bhairab-Mymensingh line with its branches which were difficult of access by rail from the main Assam-Bengal Railway line and were more easily administered by the Superintendent, Government Railway Police, Saidpur, Bengal) should be under the Superintendent, Railway Police, Chittagong. The Railway Police Superintendent could not be a member of the railway staff and should not be under the control of the Agent, Manager or other railway authorities.

Mr. Giles mentioned that the Agent, Assam-Bengal Railway, in writing to the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Rajshahi Range, Bengal, on 3rd March 1919, stated that he did not consider it advisable to transfer the portions of the Assam-Bengal Railway system lying within the civil districts of Mymensingh and Dacca to the Superintendent of Railway Police, Eastern Bengal Railway, Saidpur. He was in favour of transferring the Police administration of the whole Assam-Bengal Railway to the Bengal Police, his reasons being—(1) The most populated portion of the Assam-Bengal Railway system fell in Bengal; (2) the headquarters of the Railway were at Chittagong in Bengal; (3) the Inspector-General of Police, Assam, could not make frequent inspections or keep in touch with the headquarters of the Railway Administration, (4) he thought better recruits and more experienced police officers could be obtained in Bengal. He also added that greater development of the Assam-Bengal Railway in the future would occur south of Badarpur in Dacca and Mymensingh Districts in Bengal and between Chittagong and Akyab in Burma.

The Superintendent of Railway Police, Saidpur, advocated in 1919 that the branches within the civil districts of Mymensingh and Dacca should be under Eastern Bengal Railway Police on account of the influx of criminals from Bihar and upcountry. Colonel Cameron, Agent, Eastern Bengal Railway, wrote in reply to the Inspector-General of Police, Assam, suggesting that the whole of the Dacca portion of the Railway should be transferred to Chittagong jurisdiction and the rest of the metre-gauge placed under the Superintendent of Railway Police, Saidpur, which was approved by the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Police in his letter dated the 19th August 1919.

Inspector Syed Hashmatullah was of opinion that imperialization would be an improvement on the present system as the present Inspector-General of Police could hardly take any special interest in the Railway Police.

Inspector Upendra Chandra Deb thought that the present system could not be improved.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government was of opinion that the present organization was the most efficient combined with economy. It ensured the maximum co-operation with the District Police, a matter vital to the detection and prevention of crime, compatible with the organization of the Railway Police force as a separate unit. The inclusion of the different railway systems in the province under the respective Range Deputy Inspectors-General would further strengthen co-operation. The proposal (b) was quite impracticable. For obvious reasons the separation of the Railway Police from railway control was a vital matter. The organization of the Railway Police as a department of a railway system would weaken Government control which it was essential should be fully maintained, and would lead to complete cleavage with the District Police, and a corresponding loss of efficiency. The other arrangements suggested would tend to weaken co-operation, while complete amalgamation of the Railway Police with the District Police would, on the other hand, unnecessarily split up the force, lead to confusion in the number of Superintendents the railway authorities would have to refer to, and would result in the loss of such technical knowledge as the Railway police now possessed, and consequent loss of efficiency.

Mr. Marree, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, said that though imperialization might mean better administration the loss of touch with the District Police seemed to be vital. The idea of the Railway Police being under the Range Deputy Inspector-General was largely based on that belief. At present the Railway Police in Bihar had not very much to complain about lack of co-operation, although things were not as satisfactory as they might be. It seemed, however, that Imperialization would make the cleavage much greater, although the idea of Imperialization was very fascinating. "There are obvious difficulties when you are running a line in another jurisdiction."

Mr. Leckie, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, considered that the present system of organization was the most satisfactory, but would prefer to have the Railway Police under the Range Deputy Inspector-General, as there would be more co-operation between the Railway Police and the District Police.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, was not in favour of any of the three suggestions. He preferred Range control to control by the Criminal Investigation Department (because with a Range Deputy Inspector-General in charge there was a better chance of getting good men drafted into the Railway Police from the ranges), but would prefer a special Deputy Inspector-General for Railways to either, because the Range Deputy Inspector-General had much work to do and was not inclined to look upon the Railway Police as of very much importance so far as Range work was concerned. As regards separation from the District Police, he asked what it was proposed to do on the occasion of strikes and disturbances where the railways were attacked or when it was desired to put armed guards on bridges. With reference to the recent strike in Howrah, it would be a more satisfactory solution if the Bengal Government controlled their own railway line, especially in the case of strikes. Experience in the past had shown that internal disturbances had resulted in the railways being attacked, and the District and Railway Police should be under the same control. The Inspector-General, Bihar and Orissa, had proposed the transfer of the Howrah-Khargpur line to the Bengal Police in consequence of recent trouble at Howrah and he had recommended to him that the other section should be added.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, considered that the present system was satisfactory. He suggested that the Superintendent of Railway Police might be authorized to punish and reward the watch and ward staff.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar preferred the present provincial system. Imperialization would greatly weaken the co-operation between the Railway and the District Police. He was not in favour of amalgamation with the District Police for reasons given in reply to Question 18. To put the Railway Police under the Railway by making the Superintendent the head of a Railway Department was out of the question.

Inspector Fauzdar Narain Kaur was of opinion that Imperialization would be a better system than the present one.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that the present system was most suitable. He agreed with the suggestion made by the Deputy Inspector-General, Crime and Railways, that it would be desirable to have a senior Railway Police officer attached to the Railway Board in a position somewhat analogous to the Director, Intelligence Bureau, who would be responsible for securing uniformity of procedure in the Railway Police throughout India. Such an appointment would result in the Railway Police carrying weight with the Railway Administrations. Such an officer, however, should have nothing whatever to do with the internal administration of the various Railway Police forces. He might be assisted by a small detective force for each railway. There should be a uniform Railway Police Manual for the whole of India. It would be easy for the Government of India to appoint a Committee to draft it. All Government servants worked under the same Civil Service Regulations. There was a case against uniform rules on particular points:—if experience in different parts of India justified certain procedure, as for instance, in some parts of the country shortage from a wagon with broken seals was accepted as a *prima facie* evidence of theft, in other parts of India the inference was not accepted and something more was required. There was no necessity for imperialization of railways. The chief grounds alleged for the necessity for a change were: firstly, that there was no uniformity of procedure, a matter which the Government of India could remedy; and secondly that there were inter-provincial cases which were difficult to detect. In the Central Provinces these cases amounted to roughly 1 per cent. The great requisite in all police work was co-operation between different systems of police, but in imperialization that co-operation would be lost. "You are going to lose what is good for the sake of one or two per cent. of cases." It would not be possible for the railways to correspond with only one officer. There was practically no correspondence between the headquarters officers and the Police. The difficulties experienced by the railway authorities were that the Police they dealt with had different procedures. Many of these difficulties could be removed by the joint action of Railway authorities, the Railway Board and the Government of India. If the railways could deal with one man there was no reason why they could not deal with 10. If a separate Railway Police Force were formed there would not be the same co-operation as now existed. The system however existing in Bombay and Bengal under which the Range Deputy Inspector-General looked after the Railway Police of his Range was not sound.

Mr. Hurst, Additional Superintendent of Police, Saugor, did not consider that any other but the present system would work satisfactorily, though there were delays in getting answers to enquiries from other provinces. Imperialization would tend to make co-operation with the District Police more difficult. It would not improve the present-day inter-provincial co-operation and the service would not be popular. The system of amalgamation with the District Police was worked before the present system and was found unsatisfactory.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, agreed.

Inspector Gáachan was opposed to any alteration.

Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan was in favour of a system under which—(a) The Railway Police would remain provincial under the control of one Director-General of all the Indian Railways who would have a small staff and a detective staff on each railway under his control. (b) The Superintendent, Railway Police, would remain under the provincial Inspector-General. (c) The other Railway Police subordinates would not be treated as on Foreign Service. Their promotions, etc., should remain under the direct control of the Provincial Inspector-General. (d) The recommendations of the Railway Director-General about any subordinate should always be accepted and acted on by the Provincial Inspector-General.

The introduction of this system would have the following advantages:—(1) Common procedure. (2) Co-operation between the different Police and Provinces and responsibility of undetected important cases would be greatly improved. (3) Railways would be required to take more interest in the Railway Police than they did at present. (4) Location of crime would be easy.

A Railway Police Criminal Gazette would assist greatly.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Nagi was of opinion that the organization of the Railway Police on a provincial basis was satisfactory and required no improvement or alteration.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula considered that the present system, with one head for the whole of the Railway Police in India, would be an improvement.

Hyderabad (Daccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, Hyderabad, in his written evidence was of opinion that the present system was the best and that any other system would not be an improvement. Imperialization would not improve matters but a Provincial Deputy Inspector-General irrespective of the Criminal Investigation Department where work was heavy would be an improvement as he would be able to give his undivided attention to railway work. Each railway should as far as possible have its own Superintendent of Police and as many Assistants as necessary. In his oral evidence he stated that he had since read Mr. Ross' note and the figures and facts he had put forward and had reconsidered his views. He thought Imperialization was the only solution. He was not in favour of the amalgamation of the District Police with the Railway Police—the Railway Police should be a separate force and the officers and men should not be interchangeable with the District Police.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that he advocated imperialization which would however cost money. The Inspector-General, Government Railway Police, should be a member of the Railway Board and an adviser on policy with the Government of India similar to the Inspector-General of Forests. Deputy Inspectors-General of Police should be stationed as far as possible at the head-quarters of large railway systems and should exercise control over complete systems, with sections similarly constituted under them. Deputy Inspectors-General should have entire administrative control subject to the reservations now existing to local governments which would be exercised by the Imperial Inspector-General. In short, Deputy Inspectors-General would exercise the powers and functions which he himself did in his present appointment. Otherwise the work would be far beyond the control of one Inspector-General. The gazetted officers would be drawn from the cadre of provinces and officers after electing to stay on and after being accepted would be eligible for vacancies occurring in the rank of Deputy Inspector-General. The non-gazetted ranks would be recruited within the jurisdiction of Deputy Inspectors-General and promoted within that cadre which would ensure local knowledge. If more powers were not given to the Deputy Inspector-General the work would be too much for one or even two Inspectors-General. His idea was to keep the Deputy Inspector-General at the headquarters of the Railway and, if possible, he would be a part of the Company or State Railways. There would be co-operation between him and the railways and he would always be in touch with the Provincial Inspectors-General. Within his jurisdiction he would have to keep his subordinates as a complete force so that it would not be possible for a Sub-Inspector from Madras to be brought over to Bombay. Imperialization of the Railway Police would not result in loss of co-operation with the District Police. If the Imperial Inspector-General became a member of the Railway Board much better co-operation with the different systems of railways would be ensured. Friction between Railway officials and the Railway Police would be considerably

reduced if the subordinates realized that the Deputy Inspector-General and the Superintendent of Railway Police were equal officials with the Traffic Superintendents or Executive Engineers. There was no friction between the Railway and Police officials in the higher ranks. The Deputy Inspector-General would in fact advise the Agents and the views of the Imperial Inspector-General would carry weight with all Railways if he were a member of the Railway Board. Correspondence between the Imperial Inspector-General and the Provincial Inspector-General would be in the form of semi-officials, but they would also have the power to write direct officially. The function of the Deputy Inspector-General as regards the administration of the Police would be to control all the financial part of it, to decide all questions regarding the strength of the Police, etc. There should be the same procedure throughout India but the Deputy Inspector-General should have powers to modify it according to his particular province. There was no necessity for a separate Railway Criminal Investigation Department organization. The Provincial part of the organization would be very much the same as that of the Post Office. The Railway Police force would be imperialised from the point of view of administration, but there was no necessity to imperialize the rank and file who would be kept more or less in the province being in touch with local conditions. If local knowledge were lost the value of the Police was gone. It was necessary for the Railway Police to have knowledge of District Police working. Gazetted officers should be taken from the District Police after 8 or 9 years' service. The position of the Deputy Inspector-General, Railways, with the Agent would be one of co-operation and not of control. If there was a difference of opinion the Inspector-General would be referred to. The Imperial Inspector-General would have as much work as a Provincial Inspector-General as he would have to deal with the whole of India. It was essential that he should be a touring officer.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, favoured the present provincial basis. He thought that a high police official known as the Director-General or Inspector-General of Railway Police in India should be appointed to deal with important questions and where necessary take them before the Government of India. He would have control. If he found that a police officer in a certain province did not register a certain type of offence or if he was registering cases which should not be registered he would write to the Inspector-General concerned and point out the defect. He would also deal with other questions. For instance, the Sind Police had been writing since 1912 about quarters and had not yet obtained them. If there had been a Director-General of Railway Police he would have put the case before the Government of India long ago and would have secured the quarters. It would not do any good to attach a detective force to the Director-General's office as it would lead to ill-feeling between the detective staff and the regular staff unless it was arranged that members of the staff were not deputed until their services were asked for. Railway crime was sufficiently extensive in its nature to justify the creation of such a force. His objection to imperialization was that first and foremost the Inspector-General of the Province would have nothing to do with the Railway Police and it was important that he should have. The Sind men would not draw more pay. An Imperial Police force would probably get the same pay throughout. The main objection lay in the fact that in Sind there were the Railway Police, the Karachi District Police and the Larkana District Police. The system of imperialization would seriously imperil the relations between the Railway Police and the District Police. For one thing, the Police would no longer be as effective, the whole force not being under the control of one officer in the province, and moreover co-operation would suffer. Then there was the Commissioner in Sind. If imperialization was introduced he would no longer be the head of the Police. Co-operation would be affected and the striking force would no longer be the same. This was experienced when the Railway Police in Sind was under the Punjab prior to 1908. He did not think that Railway Police work in Sind would be better done if they belonged to the Punjab Police, *i. e.*, if there was one police force for the whole of Sind and Punjab. It was important also from the point of view of movements of troops that all the Police in a province should be under one control.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali was of opinion that the present organization was satisfactory, but the Railway Police Superintendent should have some kind of control over the Traffic Department, that is to say, he should have some voice in the transfers and postings of station masters and the menial staff.

Punjab.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General, considered that with an imperial organization, it would be very difficult to secure co-operation with the local police. A firmer hold of the Police would generally be obtained by having them under the Local Administration rather than under an imperial administration. In any case application would have to be made to the Local Government for assistance. Nothing more than moral pressure could be brought to bear except through the Local Government. Anything formal would also have to be done through the Local Government. He was in favour of improving the provincial agency, for instance, by introducing clearing houses for dealing with information about shortages of goods. The officers of this branch would be police officers working purely from the police point of view. The railway administration would have no control over them. They would be there to find

out what thefts had been committed. The force would be a small one consisting of about six officers for each railway administration, and would consist of head constables and sub-inspectors with probably an Inspector in charge. It would be very difficult under a form of imperialization to draw out one set of rules that would apply to the whole of India, but possibly rules could be made applicable as regards investigation and registration of cases and watch and ward. Rules could also be laid down for the whole of India as to what procedure was binding on the Police. As regards questions of common policy, there might be uniform rules as regards a few fundamentals.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that the model system of organization would be on an imperial basis. The successful introduction of this organization, however, postulated the existence of a Railway Police of such efficiency that it could do without the support of the Local Government, and at the same time secure the co-operation of the District Police forces. The Punjab Railway Police had certainly not arrived at such a stage of perfection. At the same time, however, it was highly desirable that steps should be taken to co-ordinate Railway Police work and methods throughout India, and to establish an intelligence clearing house for the provincial forces, which could best be effected by the creation of a central authority having the same relations with provincial Railway Police forces as now obtained between the Government of India Central Intelligence Bureau and the provincial Criminal Investigation Departments. The central bureau would be under a Director-General assisted by a Deputy Director with a representative subordinate staff. Each provincial force would be under a Deputy Inspector-General or Commissioner of Railway Police, the former title to be employed if the force was subordinate to the Inspector-General of Police and the latter if the force was to be immediately under the Local Government. The Director-General would be a *liaison* officer whose main function would be the collection and analysis of information and the introduction and maintenance as far as possible of a uniform procedure. With regard to the appointment of an imperial Inspector-General of Railway Police, Railway Police officers would be in a stronger position if they felt that they had some officer who could come and talk on equal terms with the local Inspector-General and the Local Government whenever necessary. Inspectors-General in the Punjab during the past 20 years had not as a rule had any actual experience of Railway Police work.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, and Inspector Ghulam Dastgir were in favour of a scheme of imperialization.

North-West Frontier Province.

The Administration of the North-West Frontier Province was of opinion that in order to obtain the maximum of co-operation with the District Police control should most certainly be provincial.

Mr. Tomkins, Inspector-General, preferred the present provincial system.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Mohammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, stated that the present provincial system appeared to be the best arrangement. From many points of view control by railway systems, *i.e.*, one controlling officer for the whole North-Western Railway as head of a Railway Department would be a better solution, but "this arrangement is bound to fail when the question of co-operation with the District Police comes to be tackled." He was the first officer to take charge when the North-West Frontier Police was separated from the Punjab Police. Co-operation was much better when the whole police force was under one Inspector-General. Even at present the District Police never willingly helped the Railway Police unless compelled to do so, and when he was in the District Police he looked upon the Railway Police as "a corps of chaprasis" and not people whom it was incumbent upon him to help. Imperialization would improve matters so far as railway work was concerned, but not so far as co-operation between the Railway Police and District Police was concerned. The co-operation of the District Police was very important to the Railway Police as in many cases the property was taken away into the District Police jurisdiction and searches had to be made far away from the Railway Police jurisdiction. With an imperial police force even greater difficulties than were at present felt would be experienced.

Simla.

Colonel Kaye, Director, Intelligence Bureau, Simla, stated that the Intelligence Bureau was originally intended to deal with both crime and political matters, but the latter assumed such importance later that crime gradually received less and less attention and had now almost ceased to be dealt with. Reports of certain criminal matters were still received, but inquiries were not pursued. The most satisfactory way to organize a Central Railway Police Bureau of information and advice would be to have a branch in the office of the Director, Intelligence Bureau, for both Crime and Railways controlled by a Deputy Director and an Assistant Director. Crime and Railways could not be separated, because they were very closely connected. Forgery and coining were very largely railway matters because railway booking offices were favourable places for passing bad money. Another form of crime where the two were thrown into particularly close conjunction was poisoning. Organized gangs of poisoners frequently made use of railways in their operations. The strength of his staff was one Deputy Director and a Personal Assistant, an Assistant Director and two special officers, whose sanction was due to the war and who would, in the ordinary

course, automatically disappear after its official conclusion. He had no detective staff. He had, however, four Deputy Superintendents, whom he used in cases of more than provincial importance. Before deputing these officers he wrote to the province originally concerned:— "I propose sending so and so if you have no objection and I hope that his advice may be of assistance." The officer deputed did not work out the case himself and had no executive authority but was present in an advisory capacity with special reference to the line of inquiry that could most usefully be taken up in a case that concerned more provinces than one. He himself was also purely an advisory officer. If the Railway and Crime work in his office were united there certainly would be the risk of having the same experience as had been felt in the provinces when the Criminal Investigation Department work was combined with the railway work, that is, that the Criminal Investigation Department work swamped the railway work, but he did not think that in practice it would be difficult to avoid it. If there was a separate organization with a Co-Director, there would be divided allegiance and the system would not work well. There might be two Directors, one for political work and the other for Crime and Railways so long as there was one head who could speak for both. His idea was that there should be an Additional Secretary to Government appointed *ad hoc*. If it were decided that there should be a Director, he should be entirely separate and not a Co-Director. He was in favour of having one Deputy Director for Crime and Railways working under him, but if the Government were prepared to find the money for a separate and complete office he did not see any reason against it. With reference to the suggestion that in a combined office the officer dealing with Crime might find it difficult to deal with Railways as there would never be any real urgency about "Railway" work, whereas all "Crime" work would be urgent and Mr. Ross's further suggestion that one officer could not do the whole work unless he had an assistant to look after Crime, as he would be useless if he did not tour India every year, he was prepared to modify his view to the extent that if Government could find the money it would be better on the whole to have a separate office but only on the condition that there was one head for both offices. He might be an Additional Secretary to Government for Crime, Intelligence and Railways, so that both Directors could refer to him.

Question No. 36.—Are the Railway Police liable to be called on to provide special guards in times of unrest, strikes, etc.? If so, can such arrangements be made without interfering prejudicially with the general work of the Railway Police?

United Provinces.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General, did not think that any special guards had ever been provided from the Railway Police.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, said that he did not find the Railway Police organization upset by the Railway Security Scheme.

Mr. Sharpe, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that the Railway Police were liable to be called upon to provide special guards in times of unrest, strikes, etc., but such arrangements could not be made without interfering prejudicially with the general work of the Railway Police.

Bombay.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General, stated that guards had to be supplied in times of unrest, strikes and the like. All the men required could not be supplied from the Railway Police and reinforcements had to be detailed from the districts. This system entailed considerable disadvantages. In such times the full strength of police would generally be required in the districts, especially in future as industrialism spread over the country. For that reason he was of opinion that the military authorities should be responsible for safeguarding all lines of primary strategic importance, lines of minor importance being guarded by the police.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, Southern Range, stated that the Railway Police were liable to be called on to provide special guards in times of unrest, strikes, etc., and that such arrangements could not be made without interfering prejudicially with the general work of the Railway Police.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Mr. Austin, Deputy Superintendent, and Sub-Inspector Rege, agreed.

Madras.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, stated that the Railway Police were liable to be called on to provide special guards in times of unrest, strikes, etc., but as they were not an armed force in practice, guards had usually to be supplied by armed reserves. The strength of the force was also insufficient to supply any large guard without interfering with ordinary duties.

Instructions on the matter are laid down in Police Order 669-A, Volume I.

Bengal.

The Railway Police are called upon to provide guards in times of strikes but such arrangements cannot be made without interfering prejudicially with the general working of the Railway Police.

Mr. Simpson, Deputy Inspector-General, Bardwan Range, stated that the District Police were utilized which was a suitable arrangement.

Assam.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, stated that the Railway Police were liable to be called on to provide special guards in times of unrest, strikes, etc., but in practice this duty would devolve on the District Police if the strike broke out at district headquarters where there was always an armed reserve. The Railway Police were unarmed.

Inspector Hashmatullah stated that arrangements could not be made without interfering with general work.

Bihar and Orissa.

The Bihar and Orissa Government stated that the Railway Police were liable to be called on, but the strength of the force did not permit of such arrangements without interference with general duties. The fact also that the Railway Police were unarmed and untrained in the use of arms made them of little use for such work. Districts were invariably called in for assistance in such cases, the District Armed Police being utilized for the purpose.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar stated that hitherto the Railway Police had very seldom been called upon to provide special guards in times of unrest and strikes—hence there was no provision for the purpose in the Reserve. Conditions, however, were fast changing and he thought that such a provision should be made for future contingencies. The Railway Police should have a small armed force attached to it.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, stated that the Railway Police had extra duties to perform on such occasions but could secure assistance from the District Police.

Messrs. Hurst, Mayberry and Glackan, agreed that Railway Police work was not hampered by this arrangement.

Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan and Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula considered that the arrangements could not be made without interfering with the general work of the Police.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Yes. The general duties are interfered with.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that the Railway Police were liable to be called on to provide special guards in times of unrest, strikes, etc., but such arrangements entailed interference with the proper work of the Police.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, stated that the Railway Police were called on to provide special guards in such cases, but they could not supply them without interfering prejudicially with general work.

Inspector Khan Sahib Mubarak Ali Hyder Ali thought that this could be avoided if the strength and the reserve were increased.

Punjab.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that the Railway Police were liable to be called on to provide special guards in times of unrest, strikes, etc. Naturally these arrangements could not be made without prejudice to ordinary Railway Police work, but it would be absurd and demoralising to allow a trained and disciplined police force to be exempt from the heat and burden of the day when the public peace and safety were threatened. He considered it a duty and a privilege for the Railway Police to be called upon to share in the prevention and suppression of disorder in times of trouble.

Inspector Ghulam Dastgir agreed with Mr. Stead.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, stated that the Railway Police were liable to be called upon and that such arrangements could not be made without interfering prejudicially with the general work of the Railway Police.

North-West Frontier Province.

The Railway Police are liable to be called on to provide special guards in times of unrest, strikes, etc., but the District Police assist.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Muhammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, stated that without a Railway Police reserve such arrangements interfered with the general working of the Railway Police force.

Question No. 37.—How are the Superintendents' charges distributed in your province?

United Provinces.

The Railway Police are divided into three sections—

Section A includes the Great Indian Peninsula and East Indian Railways,

„ B „ the Oudh and Rohilkhand and North-Western Railways,

„ C „ the Bengal and North-Western Railway and the Rohilkhand and Kumaon Railway.

Mr. Kaye, Inspector-General, stated that the Railway Deputy Inspector-General had in addition to his railway work a range of 7 districts along the line. This was a temporary arrangement and was not satisfactory.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, did not consider that the Superintendent of Railway Police was overworked. There was one difficulty: he had a large charge and it was absolutely impossible for him to keep any check on investigations in progress just as the District Superintendent of Police did. He did not see how he was going to exercise such a check. The only way was to improve the calibre of the Divisional Inspector or to replace him by a gazetted officer of the rank of Assistant Superintendent of Police or Deputy Superintendent of Police. An Indian Inspector would be better for investigation, but not so good for control. A gazetted officer could do both if he were kept for a reasonable time, say for 7 or 8 years. An ordinary Deputy Superintendent would be as good as the present Divisional Inspector for control. The entire burden could not be thrown on the Superintendent. If the Superintendent of Police had to keep up a Crime Register for the whole of "A" Section it would take him 3 or 4 hours daily to do this work. Such a check could be exercised by the Assistant Superintendent of Police or Deputy Superintendent of Police provided that he was given a charge which was not greater than that of the Divisional Inspector.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent of Police, stated that in his section he had a Deputy Superintendent to assist him in checking the sub-sections and he had not found his clerical work too heavy. In all important cases he saw the diaries and the police officers' reports. The Divisional Inspectors dealt with them in ordinary cases.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent of Police, thought a great deal of correspondence might be reduced because in the Railway Police there was much duplication of work, e.g., Missing Goods Registers. A telegram received in connection with a case had first to be entered into the daily diary and then a copy made into the missing goods register and so on. The same duplication occurred in connection with the Accident Register. In all cases where there were registers for particular matters there should be no need for double entry which led to additional clerical work in the Inspector's office.

Inspector Macleod said that a great deal of superfluous clerical work could be done away with, for instance, when a crime was registered a crime report was submitted to the head office. It was again returned for further report or an extract of an order was sent for further report. The Deputy Traffic Manager's letter in the case was also sent for report. In each case Inspectors practically gave two or three reports.

Inspector Murphy did not think that the clerical work could be reduced.

Bombay.

One Superintendent, North-Western Railway in Sind.

One Superintendent, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

One Superintendent, Great Indian Peninsula and Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways with an Assistant.

Mr. Holman, Deputy Inspector-General, was of opinion that there should be a separate Superintendent for the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway which arrangement was in force up to the time of the Police Commission and that Superintendents' charges should be levelled up limiting the Great Indian Peninsula Superintendent's charge to Bhusawal exclusive while that of the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway might be extended to Bangalore.

Madras.

There are two Districts, one for the South Indian Railway and one for the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Bengal.

There are three Superintendents of Railway Police in the Province: one for the Bengal Section of the East Indian Railway, and two for the Eastern Bengal Railway. A portion of the latter Railway passes through Assam. Divisional Inspectors are Indians who have no difficulty in getting on with European members of the Railway staff.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police, Howrah, stated that Inspectors submitted Progress Reports in all cases where property worth more than Rs. 500 was involved. He made suggestions on the reports. He maintained a Crime Register.

Assam.

Only one charge. Head-quarters at Chittagong in Bengal.

Bihar and Orissa.

(a) East Indian Railway system.—One Superintendent with head-quarters at Patna.

(b) Bengal Nagpur Railway system.—One Superintendent with head-quarters at Khargpur.

(c) Bengal and North-Western Railway system.—One Assistant Superintendent with head-quarters at Samastipur (A Superintendent of Police has been provided for in the reorganisation scheme.)

NOTE.—The Bengal Nagpur Railway Superintendent has, in addition to the Railway in the province, the charge of the whole line from Howrah to Khargpur, also Bankura loop line in Bengal. A certain proportion of the East Indian Railway in this province is under Bengal. Government of India Notification No. 246, dated the 6th April 1916.

Central Provinces.

Eastern and Western Sections, the former comprising the Bengal Nagpur Railway with head-quarters at Raipur, and the latter the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, the East Indian Railway and a small portion of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway with head-quarters at Hoshangabad.

Rajputana.

Only one charge.

Mileage—1,504.

Sind.

There is one Superintendent for the Sind Railways—923 miles. He is the only gazetted officer on the line.

Punjab.

One Assistant Inspector-General, one Assistant Superintendent of Police, and four Sub-Divisional Officers (Deputy Superintendents of Police) in charge of Sub-Divisions, comprising 7 to 8 Police stations. Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that the Assistant Superintendent of Police and Sub-Divisional Officers had the disciplinary powers of a Superintendent of Police.

North-West Frontier Province.

In the North-West Frontier Province there is one charge which is held by the Deputy Superintendent in charge of Railway Police with full powers of a Superintendent.

Question No. 38.—Have you any further suggestions to make on matters germane to the present enquiry?

United Provinces.

Mr. Begbie, Deputy Inspector-General, wished to emphasize one point, namely, the question of uniformity of procedure. The duties of the Railway Police ought to be laid down generally for the whole of India and there should be no divergence in practice in the various provinces. The absence of a common code had led to no co-operation at all and no exchange of ideas. Everything stopped short at the door of a province. One province registered a case, another did not. His personal opinion, which he had enforced in his own way, was that a case should be forthwith registered and taken up where it was reported irrespective of its possible venue. At the present moment the general tendency was to shift responsibility by saying that the case did not happen within a certain jurisdiction. If there had been any clue at all it was lost in a mass of writing. Such a system might involve long absence of officer

from their jurisdictions, but an officer could be allowed to go back after the authorities at the spot were satisfied that he had prosecuted the enquiry properly and had located the offence. All the good rules from the various manuals should be extracted and formed into a general Manual for the whole of India. Then again there was the question of office work. There was a mass of correspondence in the Superintendent's office which led to no results. Inspectors also had too much office work. There were a number of unnecessary references from Traffic Managers about missing goods.

Mr. Bell, Superintendent, Railway Police, was of opinion that missing goods rules should be made uniform for the whole of India.

Mr. Arch, Superintendent of Police, thought that definite orders should be laid down as to who should decide regarding prosecutions in accident cases. Generally Railways, especially Company Railways, were opposed to prosecutions. Regarding the suggestion to divide the jurisdictions of the present five Divisional Inspectors into three sub-divisions in charge of gazetted officers he was of opinion that the scheme would work well. He also stated that the real cause of the trouble on the railways was the failure of the railway authorities to enforce responsibility on subordinates. There was an immense inertia to be overcome on the part of the railway in regard to crime and railway officers often said that they would prefer to pay claims than to have the Police interfere in the sheds. "You cannot work out cases without pressure in India and the Railway Police are not in a position to exert pressure."

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Deputy Superintendent, stated that Inspectors had not sufficient time for inspections and line work. Correspondence should be reduced. There was too much duplication. Telegrams for instance were entered in full in the diary and in the missing goods register.

Inspector Mucleod stated that several reports had to be submitted in each case, one for instance to the Superintendent of Police and another to the Traffic Manager, etc.

Inspector Farrant stated that the Divisional Inspector had so much office work to perform that it was impossible for him to give the supervision that was so necessary for good results, and recommended that he should be given a clerk who knew English, to deal with routine correspondence. All Railway Police officers from the rank of constables should be literate in English. Pay and prospects should be made much better in order to attract a better class of men. Everyone should be eligible for promotion to the superior grade irrespective of the rank he held on enlistment, provided of course that he was fit for the post.

Bombay.

Mr. Robertson, Inspector-General of Police, thought that it was the duty of the railway administration to develop and improve the Watch and Ward staff so as to discharge their responsibilities for the goods in their care.

The Police required the following improvements:—

- (1) a Deputy Inspector-General for Railways;
- (2) a detective staff;
- (3) better co-operation than at present between Railway and District Police;
- (4) frequent personal consultations between Railway Police officials of adjoining territories.

Mr. O'Brien, Superintendent, Railway Police, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, suggested:—

- (1) a large increase in the strength of the police force if the railway could not devise some mechanical means whereby goods wagons could be made more secure;
- (2) unification of the control of the Watch and Ward and Law and Order establishments;
- (3) a strong detective force to prevent loss at loading, unloading and transhipment yards;
- (4) a provincial Deputy Inspector-General to co-ordinate the systems of working on all the railways in the province who could devote all his attention to railway crime;
- (5) A uniform Police Manual for the Railway Police.

Mr. Lallubhai Hargobindas, Public Prosecutor, Godhra (Panch Mahals), suggested that the provision of a travelling Railway Magistrate would make it easier for people to come forward with complaints.

Madras.

Mr. Thomas, Inspector-General, was opposed to a uniform Railway Police Manual.

Mr. Hannington, Deputy Inspector-General, Criminal Investigation Department, suggested that the Railway Police required more arms.

Mr. Wandle suggested that the Railway Police required more arms. It was impossible to protect railway trains adequately unless the police were armed. Under section 165, Criminal Procedure Code, powers of search in the District Police limits by the Railway Police

Officer investigating the case must be made legal. He suggested that sections 61 (3), 65 and 71 (XXI) of the Madras City Police Act, III of 1885, should be made applicable to the Railway Police. A uniform Railway Police Manual might also be useful.

Bengal.

Mr. Hyde, Inspector-General, was in favour of uniform fundamental rules for the whole of India.

Mr. Bradley, Superintendent, Railway Police Howrah, suggested :—

- (a) Station yards should be better protected against trespassers. The Asansol yard was a public thoroughfare. Trespassers should be rigorously excluded.
- (b) Quarters should not be provided for menials within the station yard.
- (c) The construction of wagons needed to be improved.
- (d) Mr. Ellis' patent spring lock should be brought into universal use.
- (e) The Howrah Local Act should be extended to the more important stations. A large number of thieves had escaped justice owing to the stolen property found in their possession bearing no marks of identification.
- (f) Contracts for loading and unloading at stations should not be given to railway servants.

Inspector D. N. Mukerjee supported the above suggestions by Mr. Bradley and also suggested that the law should be so changed that possession of property suspected to be stolen from the railway might be dealt with under a special law, for instance, an Act similar to the local Howrah Act or the Calcutta Police Act. Regarding contracts Bird & Co. had that for the handling of goods but for the handling of parcels there was a very bad system under which the contract was given to an ex-railway employee who got Rs. 6 per mensem from each cooly who was expected to recoup himself by tips.

Inspector S. C. Banerjee suggested that with a view to stamping out dishonesty on the part of the railway staff and to enforcing a sense of responsibility security should be taken from all officers and men entrusted with the care of property. Each passenger train should have an Assistant Sub-Inspector with constables to record first information and other information of importance. A small compartment with a sign-board should be provided in the centre of the train. The cooly contract at big stations should be taken away from station masters.

Mr. Cook, District Magistrate, Midnapore, suggested the necessity for hospitals particularly in connection with pilgrim traffic. Last year there was an outbreak of cholera and practically no interest was taken by the railway. In 1917 plague broke out.

Assam.

The Assam Government thought that in connection with the Railway Police exactly the same general problems must exist in Great Britain, and that the Committee before writing their report would no doubt see whether they could get help from the experience of Great Britain. Also it would be an excellent thing if arrangements could be made by which Railway Superintendents could study the British system while on leave.

Mr. Giles, Superintendent, Railway Police, suggested that the question of some arrangement by which the Government Railway Police might be able to obtain trolleys at short notice might be considered. The great difficulty with regard to the question of having a special trolley at railway police stations or reserving one for their use was that men were also needed; but under Railway Rules police constables could not be allowed to run trolleys without a responsible railway official being present. Line-clear and line-blocking restrictions tended to hamper free travelling. When these difficulties were surmounted it would be a great relief to the police in cases of murder, accident, obstruction, rioting and breach of railway rules when the presence of the Railway Police officer or a stronger force was urgently required at any place on the line where there was no Government railway police station to have trolleys at their disposal.

Inspector Syed Hashmatullah mentioned (1) to prevent thefts from sealed wagons in running trains after breaking the seals, the top bolt should be fastened by some instrument so that the wagon door could not easily be opened even if the seals were broken. (2) Railway employees generally committed thefts from consignments by taking advantage of the Risk Notes. The conditions of such Notes should therefore be improved so that the owners could lay claim in case of shortage. (3) Railway Police Inspectors should be provided with reserved carriages such as were provided to Railway Traffic Inspectors.

Bihar and Orissa.

Mr. Ezechiel, Superintendent, Railway Police, Patna, stated that it was practically impossible to obtain a conviction in cases of theft of railway material for the simple reason that (a) it was generally impossible to prove that the article recovered was stolen from any particular place, and (b) because the articles were purchasable in the Calcutta market. (c) It was very difficult to prove cases in which large quantities of grain, cloth, etc., were found in the houses of receivers. It was a well-known fact that those things were stolen from railway consignments, but it was impossible to prove that fact. The extension of the Howrah

Act No. XXI of 1857 to railway limits would help to a certain extent. The Railway Police were supposed to co-operate with the District Police. To be able to do so, they should be granted a bicycle allowance.

Mr. Cook, Superintendent, Railway Police, Khargpur, suggested that Special Magistrates should be appointed to try Railway Police cases, a central Court or Courts being established for each railway, with specially trained prosecuting inspectors. The Railway Police should be placed under Range Deputy Inspectors-General. Such a system would improve co-operation with the District Police.

Babu P. D. Misra, Deputy Superintendent, suggested that there should be some provision in the Railway Act for neglect of duty on the part of railway officials especially the Watch and Ward staff. He also recommended the immediate check of seal-defective wagons in order to shorten delay in reporting to the Police.

Inspector Inder Sen Sachar suggested a special provision as in the Howrah Act transferring the burden of proof from the prosecution to the accused with respect to property found in possession of any person which was reasonably suspected to be railway property. Cases of theft of grain, etc., or other unidentifiable articles had to be abandoned in the absence of direct proof of theft. He also suggested the provision of small carriages for the use of Railway Police Inspectors on tour. The Inspectors had to travel through a long jurisdiction and had to spend the major portion of the month on tour. Most of the stations on the Bengal and North-Western Railway line had no waiting rooms. None of the railway police stations had any Inspection Rooms attached. Lately, the railway authorities, on the representation of their Traffic Inspectors, had given such carriages to them, as well as to Audit Inspectors. These officers were of the same rank and had the same kind of duties to perform as the Railway Police Inspector who should be similarly treated.

Central Provinces.

Mr. Deighton, Inspector-General of Police, considered that the action taken by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway in cancelling the grant of privilege passes to the Railway Police was most unwise. The concession made the service popular and provided a contented force. Its discontinuance would result in increased jealousy between the Police and the Railway subordinate staff which was a very unwise economy. (2) The question of travelling allowance when an officer or subordinate proceeded outside provincial limits was one which required consideration. The Railway Police should be allowed to draw a single fare instead of daily allowance. (3) The system of the Railway Joint Enquiry after the occurrence of an accident was unsatisfactory.

Mr. Mayberry, Deputy Superintendent of Police, suggested the necessity of uniformity in Government Railway Police working and procedure throughout India.

Inspector Gluckan stated that a sub-inspector generally avoided going on a long journey as he lost heavily. If he was obliged to go to Bombay to make an enquiry he hurried through because he had to spend four or five rupees a day and only got about Re. 1 daily allowance. If a Sub-Inspector of the District Police went from Itarsi to Bombay on an enquiry he received double second class, namely, Rs. 43-8-0; half of this amount went to the railway and the other half the sub-inspector got to meet all expenses besides the daily allowance. The District Sub-Inspector either gained by the journey or received sufficient money to meet his expenses whereas the Railway Sub-Inspector incurred a loss. Railway Police Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors should be given a daily allowance within their own jurisdiction, double daily allowance outside their jurisdiction and within the province and single railway fare outside the province. The result of this differential treatment was that sub-inspectors avoided long journeys and hurried through their investigations.

Inspector Sharif Muhammad Khan suggested that sections 161-165 of the Indian Penal Code should be made cognizable without which the highhandedness of the railway staff could not be controlled and the anxieties of the public removed.

Sub-Inspector Baijnath Kaula stated that at present railway officers did not consider themselves responsible for the prevention of crime. If a certain amount of responsibility were fixed on railway officials it would help a great deal in preventing crime. The present system of sealing wagons with lac seals was defective and the introduction of special locks or stronger seals would help a great deal in the way of preventing crime.

Sub-Inspector Mazhar Nagi suggested the abolition of contract labour and introduction of a uniform procedure for the Railway Police.

Hyderabad (Deccan).

Mr. Crawford, Deputy Inspector-General, Railway Police, made the following suggestions :—

The character of railway employees should be verified at the time of enlistment.

Concessions granted to railway servants should be extended to the Railway Police.

Gazetted officers of the Railway Police should be specially selected.

The owner's risk note should be abolished.

Rajputana.

Mr. Ashdown, Inspector-General, Railway Police, stated that there was a reluctance to use sections 112 and 113 of the Railway Act because an eight-anna court-fee stamp was required on the complaint. Many thieves made a habit of travelling on the railway without tickets and did so with impunity.

Sind.

Mr. Barker, Superintendent, Railway Police, Karachi, suggested the introduction of a patent lock or bolt. It was no use sending out constables with goods trains as they were at one end and could not see on dark nights. Patrols on gradients were better.

Punjab.

Mr. Farquhar, Inspector-General, thought it was possible to draw out a set of uniform rules applicable to registration and investigation of crime and also for the organization of the Watch and Ward.

Mr. Stead, Assistant Inspector-General, stated that the insecure manner in which valuable goods and commodities were handled by the railway constituted an incitement to crime, demoralising alike to the public, railway employees and the police. Until this radical defect were removed, no conceivable improvement in the working of the Railway Police would be able to keep pace even with the increasing attention that members of criminal tribes and other habitual criminals were paying to the rich and easy spoils of the open line and goods yards.

Khan Bahadur Abdul Hakim, Deputy Superintendent, made the following suggestions:—

- (1) In these days when railway thieves committed offences armed with deadly weapons police patrols on running trains should be supplied with arms.
- (2) Unbooked goods should not be stacked in railway limits for want of wagons in order to avoid temptation to thieves.
- (3) Parcels should be kept in cages.
- (4) Open goods sheds should be fenced and locked at night.
- (5) Valuable booked goods either should be loaded at once and the wagons properly locked or should remain in locked goods sheds. The same practice should be strictly observed with unloaded goods till time of delivery.
- (6) A supervising Inspector like a Travelling Ticket Examiner should be appointed who would make surprise inspections and see that the railway staff of all branches performed their duties according to the railway rules. Such Inspectors would be more useful if appointed from among Sub-Inspectors and Inspectors of the Railway Police. At large stations such Inspectors should be maintained permanently according to local requirements to supervise the loading, unloading and safe custody of parcels as well as of goods. The introduction of the system would result in a check to pilferages and thefts by railway employees at goods sheds, transshipment yards, I.-G. vans and parcel vans.
- (7) The appointment of retired upper subordinates of the Railway Police as passenger superintendents who would check malpractices on the part of booking clerks, ticket collectors and Railway Police and would also be useful in detecting crimes in passenger halls and platforms.
- (8) Suitable punishment should be awarded to members of the railway staff found guilty or responsible for shortages of goods. At present on the occasion of large shortages trifling debits were deducted from clerks' salaries which produced no effect but merely acted as an incentive to the staff to do away with valuable property.

North-West Frontier Province.

Khan Sahib Rana Talia Mohammad Khan, Superintendent of Police, Kohat, made the following suggestions:—

- (a) Lead seals though costly would be more effective than lac seals. Some protection against the weather should be provided for card-board labels. Some automatic locking arrangements should be provided as a preventive to thefts.
- (b) Road vans should be kept locked. There should be a separate Traffic official or Railway Police head constable, apart from the guard, to supervise closely and to check the work of travelling porters.
- (c) Police Officers and Traffic officials should be rewarded for tracing mis-despatched goods or goods lost sight of in transit.
- (d) The duties of armed chowkidars were very heavy in the North-West Frontier. They should do 4 hours every night in 2 spells of duty like regular sentries.
- (e) Double doors should be provided on wagons—one to slide along the side and the other to open outward.
- (f) Goods should not be allowed to accumulate on passenger and goods platforms.

Abstract of Evidence of Railway Officers Recorded by the Committee.

QUESTIONS FOR RAILWAY OFFICERS.

Question No. 1. How are the members of the Watch and Ward establishment appointed and supervised?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, stated that the Watch and Ward were appointed by the District Traffic Superintendent and were directly supervised by Station Masters. There were four District Traffic Superintendents on the Railway which had a total mileage of 1,570 miles. There were roughly about 110 men in each district. Watchmen received Rs. 10 to Rs. 12 and Watch Jemadars Rs. 13 to Rs. 16 as pay. Uniform was given free. The posts were not pensionable: the hours of duty were 12 in the 24.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, stated that applications were received in his office direct or through Station Masters. The applicants were then called to the office and were interviewed by one of the Assistant Traffic Superintendents. If found of good physique they were employed. They were placed under the orders of the Station Master who arranged their duties which were generally six hours on and six hours off. At large stations Watch Jemadars were appointed to supervise watchmen. Preference was given to ex-Military men as Jemadars and watchmen. Owing to the war it had been somewhat difficult to recruit men of this type but more were now applying for posts. The staff of chowkidars who looked after buildings were all part of the same force.

Mr. Walsh, Traffic Inspector, Lucknow, stated that the Station Master had no power to dismiss the Watch and Ward.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Barabanki, stated that the staff at his station consisted of 12 watchmen and 3 Jemadars. The number was not sufficient. There were no watchmen for day work. They worked for 12 hours at a stretch: the hours were too long.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated that the Watch and Ward staff were appointed by the District Traffic Superintendents from any suitable men offering, preference being given to Military and Police pensioners when available. Their working was supervised by Station Masters and Yard Foremen.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, stated that the Watch and Ward staff were paid Rs. 18 on the Midland and Rs. 21 on the Great Indian Peninsula. The men must have passed 6th standard.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, stated that the pay was not sufficient to attract pensioners.

Mr. Flynn, Goods Superintendent, Wadi Bunder, stated that the men received Rs. 18 and the Jemadars Rs. 25.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, stated that members of the Watch and Ward were usually selected from amongst pensioned members of the Military and Police forces or other Departments. The yard men were controlled by the Yard Inspectors and passenger station men by Assistant Station Masters. The wages offered did not appeal to military pensioners. Such men only received Rs. 10 to 12, whereas they wanted Rs. 25 to 30.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Peekey, General Traffic Manager, stated that the Watch and Ward were appointed by the District Traffic Superintendent. The supervision was in the hands of the District Traffic Superintendent, who was assisted by Sub-Inspectors and Station Masters. Head watchmen were also employed directly to supervise the work of the Watch and Ward. The pay of watchmen at large stations ranged from Rs. 17 to Rs. 25 and of head watchmen from Rs. 21 to Rs. 30. The pay of watchmen at small stations ranged from Rs. 16 to Rs. 22. No head watchmen were posted at small stations. There was no standard for fixing the strength of the force. More men were wanted.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that the men were selected and appointed by him personally. He had 3 head watchmen and 30 watchmen.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, stated that the members of the Watch and Ward were appointed by the District Traffic Superintendent on the recommendation of Traffic Inspectors at small stations and Station Masters at large stations. At his station the watchmen started on Rs. 16 and rose to Rs. 22. Jemadars started on Rs. 23 and rose to Rs. 35. Complaints were received from the Watch and Ward Staff that the hours of duty were too long. The average beat was for 12 hours at a time. He had found that owing to this long spell of duty the men were unable to keep awake. The number of men to be appointed at a particular station was determined by taking into consideration the area of the yard, the number of sidings and the number of wagons generally stabled there.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that the members of the Watch and Ward were recruited by Station Masters at large stations and by Traffic Inspectors at other stations. The men were given no previous training. The supervision was exercised directly by Head Watchmen and Naiks where the number of men employed justified their appointment but the general supervision was exercised by Station Masters. The supervision was not adequate. Watchmen were drawn from very much the same type of men as the other railway menials. The pay of the watchmen was Rs. 14 inclusive of grain compensation allowance. There were three head watchmen on Rs. 45 to 65, twenty-eight on Rs. 35 to 40 and a number of Naiks who received up to Rs. 22. There were a number of young watchmen. On the railway men were supposed to be fit to work up to the age of 55. A man was active up to that age.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, stated that watchmen received Rs. 15 and the Jemadar Rs. 25 at his station.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that they were appointed from among registered applicants for watchmen's post, those on the Pension Paymaster's list being given preference. In regard to supervisor they were placed directly under the orders of the Station Master, who allotted to them their duties and supervised their work.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, stated that appointments were ordinarily made on probation by Station Masters subject to confirmation by the Traffic Inspector. The Station Master advised his Traffic Inspector of the appointment at once and presented the candidate at his next visit. Applicants before being appointed were called upon to produce testimonials from at least two of the following officials as to their antecedents and character: (1) Tahsildar, (2) Revenue Inspector, (3) Sub-Registrar, (4) Police Inspector or Sub-Inspector, (5) Mirasdar or such other person of known probity. The Station Master after satisfying himself with his local knowledge that the certificates produced were genuine and were reliable selected the best man available. They worked under the immediate supervision of the Station Master but for disciplinary purposes were under the Traffic Inspector. With reference to the suggestion that it was absolutely essential that the Station Master should have the power of punishing the Watch and Ward, in theory he thought it was advantageous, but in practice there was nothing to prevent Station Masters from being unduly harsh with the men. There were Traffic Inspectors in District offices and it was only a matter of reporting to them for punishment. He did not think that the removal of powers of punishment from the Station Master would result in the Watch and Ward not doing their work properly. There were two Traffic Inspectors in each district. There were no officers between them and the Watch and Ward except the Station Master, who was responsible for the whole menial staff in his station. Practically all watchmen were able to sign their names and the majority of them could read numbers. They could not read a label but they knew what a seal should look like.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that the men were selected by Traffic Inspectors for small stations and by Station Masters at large stations. They were supervised by Station Masters at small stations and by head watchmen and Station Masters at large stations.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, stated that under the orders in force, Station Masters appointed the men on probation subject to the Traffic Inspector's approval. At 1st class stations Traffic Inspectors had no control over the menial staff even for purposes of discipline. Watch and Ward were not appointed at all stations on the railway but only at first class stations and a few important goods booking stations. When the control over the menial staff at first class stations was withdrawn from the Traffic Inspector and vested in the Station Master the efficiency of the staff at that station naturally fell off.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, stated that generally military men were appointed and when such were not available, men of decent character were enlisted. These men were supervised by the head watchman, who was also an ex-military man. All the menials in general were supervised by the Yard Foreman or Platform Foreman, respectively.

Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, stated that preference was given firstly to pensioned and discharged sepoys, secondly to pensioned policemen and thirdly to Kallars, *i.e.*, a criminal class. Regarding supervision, every week a register was prepared beforehand showing the duties to be performed during that week by each member of the Watch and Ward staff, the duties being to watch the locked goods shed, the inward and outward goods stacked in sheds and in goods shed premises (not under lock and key) and to guard loaded goods wagons standing in the yard. During the day the Station Master and the Chief Goods Clerk and during the night the Station Master living in station premises (by surprise visits) saw that the orders in the duty register were carried out. The head watchman exercised constant supervision over the watchmen.

East Indian Railway

Mr. Presswell, Divisional Traffic Manager, stated that the members of the Watch and Ward establishment were appointed by the District Traffic Superintendent. At large stations the staff was generally under the control of a Jemadar; at small stations they were under the control of Station Masters. The pay was as follows:—

						Rs.
Inspector	30—2—40
Assistant Inspector	22—1—32
Corporals	16—1—24
Chowkidars at selected stations	15—1—20
Chowkidars at ordinary stations	10—1—12

The men at the time of enlistment were generally about 28 to 30 years of age; members of the menial staff drawing Rs. 15 and under Rs. 20 had the option of becoming subscribers to the Provident Fund, but where the option was once exercised withdrawal from membership during service was not permitted.

Mr. Hindley, Agent, stated that the cost of the Watch and Ward staff averaged about 4 lakhs of rupees per annum.

Mr. Harris, Goods Superintendent, Howrah, stated that there was a special force organized as follows for the Howrah goods yards:—

						Rs.
1 Superintendent for the Watch and Ward at	275
1 Assistant Chowkidari Inspector	100—200
2 Sub-Inspectors	45—85
12 Sergeants	22—32
10 Corporals	16—24
226 Chowkidars	15—20

Babu Kalka Pershad, Station Master, Jumna Bridge, stated that in the Tundla District there were two grades, one on Rs. 12—1—15 and the other on Rs. 15—1—20. He did not consider that anything less than Rs. 20 was a living wage.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, stated that they were appointed by the Station Master under orders of the District Traffic Superintendent at large stations and by Traffic Inspectors at roadside stations. Pay ranged from Rs. 11 to Rs. 15. It was optional to any man drawing Rs. 15 and upwards to subscribe to the Provident Fund. Very few joined for the reason that they preferred to have the money in hand. In the case of pensioners it was not considered necessary to take security, but in the case of others, Rs. 1 was cut from each man's pay every month. This was refunded to them six months after they left the service. They did not get any interest. At large stations the Watch and Ward were supervised by the head and assistant chowkidars and senior members of the station staff. At small stations by senior member of the station staff alone. The staff at Howrah were provided with quarters.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that the members of the Watch and Ward establishment were appointed by District officers and were supervised by the respective Station Masters and Goods Supervisors under whom they worked. In four districts on the railway, Eastern Central, Paksey and Saidpur, there were recruiting Jemadars who secured and nominated watchmen for appointment. At the Chitpur Terminals, Sealdah and Lalmonirhat, *ex-military* men were appointed and steps had also been taken to appoint such men at Naihati Junction where there had recently been a number of thefts. Where the number of watchmen employed

justified the step. Jemadars were appointed directly to supervise the working of the watchmen. The present pay of the Watch and Ward staff was as follows:—

							Annual increment. Rs.
<i>Watch Jemadars—</i>							
Ex-military	23—1—32
Others	18—1—25
<i>Watchmen—</i>							
Ex-military	19—1—22
Others	11—1—16

Increments were given only for approved service.

Members of the menial staff drawing Rs. 15 and upwards were admitted to the General Provident Fund. Joining was optional.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that the members of the Watch and Ward were appointed by the District Traffic Superintendent and were supervised by the station masters under whom they worked. An exception was, however, made in the case of the terminal station at Chittagong jetties where the Watch and Ward establishment was supervised by an officer of the superior establishment. Formerly Rs. 10 was the pay of the ordinary traffic chowkidar. Two grades had recently been instituted, one ranging from Rs. 12 to Rs. 15, and the other from Rs. 12 to Rs. 17. This arrangement had only been in operation for a short time and it was too early to say whether it was sufficient to attract a good class of men. At the jetties the pay of the Watch and Ward staff ranged from Rs. 15 to Rs. 24 for watchmen and Rs. 25 to Rs. 40 for Jemadars.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boulth, Traffic Manager, stated that chowkidars were appointed by Senior Station Masters at large stations and Traffic Inspectors at small stations. These appointments were subject to the District Traffic Superintendent's formal approval. At large stations Chowkidari Jemadars inspected and supervised the men. At small stations where there were only 1 to 4 chowkidars the station master or the goods clerk supervised. At smaller stations chowkidars were provided with quarters, but in places like Bhatinda where there were a number of men this was not possible. Where quarters were not provided it had not been the custom to give house-rent. The pay of the Watch and Ward ranged from Rs. 15 for watchmen to Rs. 23 for Jemadars. The hours of duty were six hours on and six hours off.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, stated that chowkidars were appointed by the District Traffic Superintendent and were supervised by Station Masters and Traffic Inspectors. Their pay ranged from Rs. 9-8 and the hours of duty were 12 in 24. He was of opinion that the wages given were a living wage in the middle of a wheat-growing centre. The job of chowkidar was one of the most popular in the railway. The staff were all respectable men.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, was of opinion that the Watch and Ward establishment was under-paid. A living wage was not less than Rs. 15 a month.

Babu Joruk Lal Jha, Station Master, Chupra, was also of the same opinion and placed the living wage between Rs. 12 and Rs. 15 for a man, his wife and one child.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that the member of the Watch and Ward establishment were usually appointed by Station Masters (subject to confirmation by the Traffic Superintendent) and supervised by them. The pay of the chowkidars ranged from Rs. 9-5 upwards.

Mr. Gardner, Station Master, Bareilly City, stated that in respect of supervision at Bareilly, they were under the immediate orders of a Watch Jemadar.

Question No. 2.—From what castes are the men drawn, and is any enquiry as to character made before appointment?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, stated that no restriction was made in regard to caste except that men of the sweeper class were not taken. The men's descriptive rolls were all verified by the Police.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, stated that no particular caste was sought after. Usually Brahmins, Ahirs, and Rajputs were employed. Sweepers were excluded. Descriptive rolls of all candidates were sent to the Superintendent of the District in which the men resided and applicants were only taken on after their characters had been verified as satisfactory by the local police.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated that the men were not recruited from any particular caste. Enquiries as to character were made by the Traffic Inspector or the District Traffic Superintendent. The Police were advised of all appointments.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, stated that the Watch and Ward were drawn from different castes; for example, in the Bombay District, they had Brahmins, Mahrattas, Thakurs, Kshatriyas, Telugus, Christians and Gurkhas.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, stated that the lowest castes only were excluded.

Rao Saheb G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, stated that usually Police and Military pensioners were engaged.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Pechey, General Traffic Manager, stated that watchmen were recruited from *Pardesis* (foreigners). *Ex-service* men also applied but not as many as the railway desired.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that in his yard he had 16 *Pardesis*, 10 Mahrattas, 5 Mahars and 2 Muhamadans. The men were confirmed in their appointments after their history and previous service had been verified by the Police. If the result of the police inquiry was unfavourable, the man's services were dispensed with.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, stated that as far as possible watchmen were recruited from retired policemen or sepoys but when sufficient numbers of these types were not forthcoming the railway was compelled to resort to men of the ordinary class.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Watken, General Traffic Manager, stated that the men for the Watch and Ward were drawn from the labouring classes and not from any particular caste. Hindus, Muhammadans and Pariyas were all employed. Enquiry was made by the Police as to the character of the men before they were confirmed in their appointments.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that military pensioners were appointed where possible. Their history sheets were verified by the District Police before appointment.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, stated that usually a recommendation was produced from some one in a fairly respectable position and the appointment was made subject to the character of the applicant being certified by the Railway Police to whom a Description Roll was sent.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, stated that the men were recruited from all classes, *i.e.*, Muhammadans, Sudras and Panchamas. About 90 % were illiterate.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, stated that the men were drawn from all castes and creeds.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that Nayadus and Muhammadans wherever available were appointed and their character was verified through the Railway Police. Where these men were not available, recruitment was made from other castes. In the Tanjore and Trichinopoly Districts, there were a number of Kallar villages. These men were a criminal tribe and watchmen were recruited from them, on the principle of "setting a thief to catch a thief."

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, stated that military and police pensioners were generally given preference and where these classes of men were not available (they were very difficult to get for this work which involved considerable night duty) they were recruited from Kallars and other low class people.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that the men were recruited from Muhammadans and Hindus excluding Brahmins. The railway also required the recommendation of a Sub-Magistrate or Village Munsif in addition to the verification of their character by the Police.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, stated that the men were enlisted principally from members of criminal tribes as other men were not available and it was probably a good thing "to set a thief to catch a thief." The railway was prepared to appoint pensioners, but it

was difficult to obtain them as they were not anxious to leave their homes and also because the remuneration was not sufficiently attractive. Applicants were required to produce testimonials from at least two of the following :—(1) Taksildar, (2) Revenue Inspector, (3) Sub-Registrar, (4) Police Sub-Inspector or Inspector, (5) Mirasdars or such other persons. Applicants as a rule did not find any difficulty in obtaining these certificates, especially if the Station Master at a first class station was interested in their appointments. The Police also verified the character of applicants.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, stated that the men were recruited from all castes except Brahmins. Enquiries were made in respect of their character through the Police. They also had to produce certificates from two respectable men of standing.

East Indian Railway.

Mr. Presswell, Divisional Traffic Manager, stated that the men were not drawn from any particular class, but pensioners from the Army and Police and Reservists when available were preferred as it was found that men of this class were more reliable and if they were prosecuted and convicted for theft, they forfeited their pensions which was an inducement to honesty. An enquiry as to character was made by the Police before they were permanently appointed. At Howrah each man had to give security and someone had to stand surety for his good behaviour before he was engaged.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, Mokameh Ghat, stated that the enquiry made by the Police was not satisfactory. The verification roll was returned after only a perfunctory enquiry had been made. The slipshod way in which the Police did their duty could be understood from the fact that a man was appointed three times in the same district under three different names.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, stated that the men were drawn from any class available, Gurkhas and pensioned sepoy being given preference. The characters of all applicants were verified through the Police. He had not found that *ex-sepoy*s were difficult to manage unless under their own officers. Rather he had found them more amenable to discipline and of better quality than the ordinary class of men.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that no particular caste was sought after. The men were principally natives of the United Provinces and Bihar. Enquiry was made through the Police as to character before employment. In the case of *ex-military* men the regimental record was considered sufficient.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that the men were drawn from all classes and no particular class had monopolised appointments. The antecedents of all the railway staff were verified by the Police after appointment, a descriptive roll being sent for the purpose. At the terminal yard at the Chittagong jetties, the men were mainly Punjabis and Gurkhas. Efforts had been made to obtain *ex-sepoy*s of the Indian Army, but for some time past it had been found exceedingly difficult to maintain a regular supply of these men.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boulth, Traffic Manager, stated that chowkidars were drawn from all castes except sweepers. Character rolls were verified by the Police before appointment.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, stated that about 50% of the men there were Poorbials from the United Provinces. There was often delay in receiving an answer from the Police regarding the verification of a man's character.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, said that enquiry was made from an applicant's acquaintances as to his character. He preferred *ex-sepoy*s, Pathans and Poorbials.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, said that the men were drawn from all classes except sweepers. An enquiry as to character was made by the Police before an applicant was appointed.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, stated that the men were mostly Brahmins and Rajputs. Chamars, Dosads and Sweepers were excluded. The characters of applicants were verified before they were confirmed in their appointments.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that no restrictions were imposed as to the castes from which the Watch and Ward establishment should be drawn. History sheets were sent in all cases to the District Police for verification. He thought that it would be advantageous if these history sheets were returned by the District Police to the Railway authorities through the Railway Police in order to prevent the re-employment of undesirable *ex-employees* of the railway.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly Cn., stated that the majority of the men at his station were Muhammadans and were taken into service on the recommendation of the Watch Jemadar.

Question No. 3.—Is an improvement in the class of men enlisted desirable?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, stated that an improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable. The Watch and Ward staff was inefficient. For some time efforts had been made to obtain *ex-sepoys* from the Army but this reform would cost about double the present amount for it was found that a sepoy could not be obtained for less than Rs. 20, or a Watch Havildar under Rs. 25, *plus* uniform. It was hoped that this money would be wellspent. It was contemplated to organize men in parties under the initial supervision of a pensioned Indian Army Officer and to send a party so organized to work under the Station Master of a large station, removing at the same time all the former Watch and Ward from that station. It had been found that the posting of watch sepoys piecemeal led to their either being forced to resign or compelled to share in the pilferage by the established gang of watchmen. Eventually it was hoped that a British officer as Inspector of the Watch and Ward (all Departments) directly under the Agent might be sanctioned with a suitable establishment of Inspectors for the whole line.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Clarks, stated that the pay had been raised and that sepoys were now being enlisted on Rs. 15 to 20.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, stated that an improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable and efforts were being made to obtain *ex-military* men on higher pay than was given to the yard watchmen who received Rs. 10 to Rs. 12, while military men started on Rs. 20, and Watch Jemadars on Rs. 25. At present rather elderly *ex-military* men were being obtained. In his district there were 2 military and 3 ordinary Watch Jemadars and 7 military, as against 85 ordinary watchmen. The age of the ordinary watchmen was between 28 and 35. The men were liable to transfers.

Mr. Walsh, Traffic Inspector, Lucknow, stated that the class of men at present obtained was not altogether satisfactory. Until recently non-military men were being recruited but now efforts were being made to employ military pensioners who were found better because they knew that if found guilty of malpractices they would lose their pension. The employment of pensioners would increase expenditure, but on the other hand the railway would secure the advantage of preventing thefts from valuable consignments.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Barabanki, stated that the Watch and Ward was much more satisfactory since military pensioners had been appointed for the duties. They were a better class of men and were doing good work. Formerly yard thefts were frequent but since the appointment of military pensioners only occasional cases had occurred.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, stated that a better class of men and younger men were required. He, however, liked military pensioners even though they were 55 years of age and over.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated that generally speaking the working of the existing staff was satisfactory. Improved conditions would doubtless result from an increase in the number and improvement in the class of men enlisted, as also the provision of quarters, the absence of which restricted recruiting to local applicants. Under recent increases in pay made to the staff, watchmen would draw the same pay as pointsmen.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, stated that a considerable increase in the proportion of pensioners was required.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, stated that an improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable but did not specify in what direction.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, stated that if old military pensioners of the rank of non-commissioned officer with suitable pay were appointed, there would be less pilfering.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, stated that an improvement was necessary. The wages offered did not appeal to the military pensioner.

Rao Sahib G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, was of opinion that younger men of good social standing were required.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Peechey, General Traffic Manager, stated that on the whole a satisfactory class of men was obtained. A large percentage of the foreigners were men who did not go to the Police.

Mr. Tydl, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, was of opinion that a better class of men should be recruited. Ex-Army men were the most suitable. He had always endeavoured to engage such men, but the salary and conditions of service were not a sufficient inducement to obtain them.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that an improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable, but it was almost impossible to obtain them. The service might form a means of absorbing pensioned and time-expired sepoy and policemen. Pensioners, however, after getting their pension preferred to live in their villages, and it was not possible to get many men out of Madras, whatever pay was offered.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, did not think that any improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, stated that he would like all members of the Watch and Ward staff to be pensioned sepoy but it was not easy to get such men at most stations as they did not care to go far from their native villages.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, stated that an improvement was necessary in the way of appointing men who could read and write some language. Military pensioners were preferable.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, thought that only men drawing pensions should be appointed, as they would be careful for fear of losing their pensions.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, did not think that a better class than the Army pensioner could be obtained so long as they were not too old for their work, but the more intelligent and better educated of this class were not willing to take up posts of watchmen and looked for something higher. The same fact was noticeable with other classes from whom recruits were taken but, in his opinion, intelligence above the average was hardly a thing to be looked for from a watchman. All that the railway asked for was men of good physique, and above all honest men who did their work conscientiously.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, thought that an improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable. There was a great deal of trouble due to village factions among watchmen.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, did not think that any improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, would make the appointment more attractive for military pensioners of whom regiments must now be available after the war.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, suggested that an improvement could be made if head watchmen were carefully selected. Indian military officers would be satisfactory. Such men would not stoop to connive with menials under them. He would not give such men less than Rs. 50 per mensem. It would be desirable to address military officers requesting them to send Station Masters at important stations lists showing the number of men with their names, etc., available for recruitment from their regiments to enable them to be appointed in the railway when vacancies occurred.

Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, did not think that an improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable, but that the status of the present men should be improved in order to keep them above temptation and want and also to make the appointment attractive. He would start watchmen on Rs. 15 rising to Rs. 20. A living wage for a man of the class of watchman with a wife and one child would not be less than Rs. 20 per mensem.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that men of the pensioned sepoy and police constable class had generally been found satisfactory and it was certainly desirable that the Watch and Ward staff should be recruited from that class but it had been found that such men were only available at large centres and that they preferred to work with others of their own class and could not be obtained at small stations or outlying posts where only one or two men were employed.

Mr. Prescwell, Claims Officer, stated that the class selected was as good as procurable, and improvement would be difficult.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, stated that an improvement in the class of men would be desirable if that were possible, but so far it had not been shewn that an increase in a man's pay made better work, nor did it seem to make any difference from what castes the men were drawn.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, Howrah, and *Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, Mokameh Ghat*, both stated that *ex-military* men were more suitable than the present class.

Babu Kalka Pershad, Station Master, Juma Bridge, was of opinion that the men should be drawn only from the respectable classes and might be obtained through land-owners if such an arrangement were possible.

Mr. Harris, Goods Superintendent, Howrah, stated that it was a well-known fact that although Railways offered inducements on a par with the Military and Police they did not obtain the right type of men for their Watch and Ward staff and that even if the right type were obtained they did not remain for long. More attention should be paid to recruitment and supervision. At present if one man wished to do good work others rendered his position difficult. He would like more military men. If all were made to subscribe to the Provident Fund the Railway would have a better hold. At present it was optional for those drawing over Rs. 15 to join.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, was of opinion that an improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable but a better class of men was not obtainable on the pay given, *i.e.*, Rs. 11 to Rs. 15. The maximum pay should be raised to Rs. 20.

Mr. Venkataswamy, Station Master, was of opinion that the Watch and Ward staff did not receive a living wage.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that the Watch and Ward staff were recruited from the same class as pointsmen. An improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable. The experiment of employing *ex-military* men was introduced shortly before the war. The plan as outlined provided for groups of Gurkhas, Pathans, Punjabi-Muhammadans and Sikhs to work under Jemadars of their own caste; but the plan could not be adhered to during the war and the Railway had to remain satisfied with such *ex-military* men as could be secured. The idea underlying the employment of *ex-military* men was that they were more amenable to discipline, more regular in the performance of duty and more trustworthy and that, if pensionable, they would be careful not to commit themselves so as to involve loss of pension. Literate men of the type of tally clerk might be obtained but they were not suitable for Watch and Ward. Most menials could read and write Hindi and decipher figures and numbers of wagons. An endeavour was being made to obtain more men of that class.

Mr. Meakins, District Traffic Superintendent, thought that Bhojpurias and Rajputs (but not *ex-Army* men) would be an improvement on local men.

Mr. Minahan, Transportation Inspector, was of opinion that old soldiers should not be appointed as they were physically unfit for the duties required of them.

Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, suggested that literate men should be appointed with prospects of promotion to the posts of tally clerk, checker, transhipment clerk, etc.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

Mr. Nolan, Acting Agent, thought that a better class of men might be secured by raising the pay further, although the pay of the Watch and Ward had recently been increased by over 50 %. But apart from the pay, the correct class of men was required. It was difficult to get outsiders at small stations, where only one or two men were employed, because they got into trouble with the local people. Prior to the war a considerable number of *ex-sepoys* were recruited, but in recent years the numbers available had been much below the requirements, with the result that the personnel of the Watch and Ward staff had deteriorated.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that an improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable but the inducements offered were not attractive enough for the most desirable class of men. He preferred up-countrymen but could not get as good men as he would like.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager, was of opinion that a better class of men would undoubtedly give better results. The pay had recently been increased and district officials were making attempts to improve the class by enrolling *ex-sepoys* where available.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, thought that an improvement in the class of men was most desirable. *Ex-sepoys* or reservists were the best for chowkidari work because they were fairly intelligent and well-disciplined. The men should be physically fit.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, Lahore, was of opinion that there was considerable room for improvement in the present class of men recruited.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, and *Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, Karachi*, both stated that improvement was certainly desirable, but it was not always possible to get the type of men required. *Ex-soldiers* on pension had proved very satisfactory.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, was of opinion that a fairly good class of men was obtained though a better type was needed.

Mr. Moolchand, Station Master, Hyderabad, thought that an improvement was desirable and that undesirable men should be replaced by retired military men.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, was of opinion that the class obtained was satisfactory.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, suggested that at certain large stations head chowkidars might be appointed who should be responsible to the Station Master for the men under him. This man might be a military pensioner or a man who had left the Army with exemplary character.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, did not consider that any improvement in the class of men enlisted was necessary.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, thought that military pensioners should be appointed on good salaries.

Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra, was of opinion that persons who had been educated at least up to the Upper Primary standard were required. If the present quality of chowkidars was retained the number would have to be doubled but if better men could be obtained then the present number would suffice.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that it was questionable whether the enlistment of a superior class of men would give results commensurate with the increased expenditure involved. It was really rather a matter of improving the organization than of the class of men employed. The Station Master was very vitally interested in keeping a good man at his station and very few thefts occurred from outside the railway, so that it was only against the latter contingency that an improvement in the class of men might give better results.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Inspector, Claims, was of opinion that an improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable because those appointed were for the most part local residents who engaged in other occupations during the day to the detriment of their railway duties at night.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, was also of opinion that an improvement was necessary. *Ex-Army* men who were in receipt of pensions would be preferable as their honesty and general good conduct would be guaranteed because of their pensions which would be forfeited in the event of any conviction being secured as regards malpractices.

Pundit Amrit Lal Tewari, Station Master, Budawn, also thought that an improvement in the class of men enlisted was desirable.

Question No. 4.—Do you consider that the system of having the Watch and Ward establishment under the Traffic Department works satisfactorily? If not, what are the defects and what remedies would you suggest.

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Mr. Harvey, Agent, was of opinion that there were two alternatives: (1) to put the Watch and Ward under the Police which would probably result in a certain amount of opposition from the traffic subordinates, and would, in effect, place goods for which one Department was responsible in the hands of another Department which in principle was an unsound policy; (2) the second alternative was to leave things as they were. The present system had not proved entirely satisfactory, but he preferred it to a system of Police control. Supervision depended a great deal on the personality of a Station Master. Efforts were being made to obtain sepoys and pensioners and in this way to organize a better Department but the scheme would involve the expenditure of much more money.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, was in favour of the establishment continuing under the Traffic Department. The direct supervision of the work of the Watch and Ward staff by the Station Master at each station must continue as an essential part of the organization. It would be a disadvantage if the Watch and Ward establishment were transferred to the control of the Railway Police. Duality of control would result. The Watch and Ward under Police orders would not obey the Station Master because he would not have any control over them. Where a Station Master had control he could secure obedience of a sort. He did not approve of the proposal that the Police should lend men for the Watch and Ward establishment. He considered that the Watch and Ward should be kept distinct from the Police. Police training and outlook were entirely different from that of the civil railway employee. Police discipline approximated rather to that in force in the Army than to that imposed on civil railway employees. The Policeman lent to the railway but not permanently divested of his Police personality would never tolerate being talked to by the Station Master. So far as civil supervision was concerned the Station Master had enough time to supervise his Watch and Ward. He posted them on definite beats and made surprise visits occasionally and took their reports as required. At Lucknow, for instance, one part of the yard was under the control of the Station Master and the other part under the Goods Supervisor. Each of these officials arranged for the posting and general supervision of the Watch and Ward in his sphere by direct contact. They were also assisted by Watch Jemadars.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims Branch, approved of the present system of Watch and Ward and was not in favour of the suggestion that the force should be transferred to the Police Department. The present arrangements were satisfactory and there was no need for a separate Department under the Traffic Manager. His objection to such a transfer was that increased cost would result and he did not think that better conditions would be obtained. The Watch and Ward must remain under the Station Master or otherwise divided responsibility would create difficulty in fixing individual liability. The suggested transfer to the Police Department would create friction between the Station Master and the Police. The Watch and Ward had recently been greatly improved and sepoys were now employed on good salaries. He thought that all that was possible was being done.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, thought that the Watch and Ward staff should be entirely free from Police control or interference. He would not agree to having Policemen deputed to work in the Traffic Department because divided responsibility would result. "We book the goods and I think we ought to look after them."

Mr. Walsh, Traffic Inspector, Lucknow, stated the Watch and Ward establishment worked well under the Traffic Department and railway authorities had a better grip of them than it they were under anyone else. If they had a separate officer to control them they would become independent of the Station Master and the Station Staff—particularly at night when there was only the Assistant Station Master on duty. They would ignore the station staff altogether.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Bara Banki, was of opinion that the Watch and Ward ought to remain under the Railway Administration, and subject to the control of the Traffic Officer who was responsible for the booking of consignments and safe custody of goods.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, stated with reference to the suggestion that a special branch should be created under the Traffic Department to take over the control of the Watch and Ward, that such an arrangement would make the organization very expensive because supervision would have to be provided and one man alone could not do it. He would also have to be supplied with an office to run the organization. Under the present arrangement the Watch and Ward staff were under the supervision of the Traffic Inspector. He did not think it advisable to adopt the suggestion that control of the chowkidars should be removed from the Station Master, because the staff would then be left without efficient control.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, was of opinion that the present system was satisfactory.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, stated that on the whole the Watch and Ward establishment had worked satisfactorily but the men should be more highly paid and should have free quarters provided for them. At present no quarters were supplied.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, stated that the system at present was not very satisfactory, but if a better class of men could be recruited with more able supervision, the same system would meet all requirements. Gurkhas on Rs. 18, were employed in the coal-fields and warehouses in Bengal and were found satisfactory. There were 72 watchmen in the Bombay District for 37 stations, and a length of line of 159 miles.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, stated that the system had worked as satisfactorily as could be expected with the class of men obtained. If, however, watchmen were recruited from military pensioners, thieving would be reduced to a minimum, particularly if goods sheds were enclosed with strong iron bars and gates.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, thought that the system of having the Watch and Ward under the Traffic Department was unsatisfactory. If, however, the men worked with the Police, all went well. He suggested that the Railway should have its

own Superintendent of Police and that the Watch and Ward should be taken over by his department. Under such a system the supervision of the Station Master would still be essential. He did not approve of control by the Police under the present system.

Rao Sahab G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, stated that the present system had worked fairly. The staff, however, should be strengthened.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Peckey, Traffic Manager, did not consider that the Watch and Ward staff were sufficiently numerous for the duties they had to perform. Schemes were under consideration both for adding to the numbers as well as for increasing the amount of supervision. Matters had become so bad that it was felt necessary to improve conditions which could not be done unless the supervision over the staff was highly paid. An experiment was being made in that direction by appointing a retired Police Inspector from the Rajputana Railway Police. He had been taken on as a Watch and Ward Inspector and was organizing the staff and supervising their work in detail. To do the work properly, he required assistance which would be given to him if the experiment was found to be a success. The idea was to divest the Station Master of his control over the Watch and Ward as the present system had not been satisfactory. There would be a separate staff for the purpose except in small stations. He did not consider that the arrangement of having the Watch and Ward staff under the Traffic Department and the Crime and Order staff a separate staff under the Railway Police was satisfactory. It meant divided responsibility and that alone was enough to wreck any system. The idea of a separate Watch and Ward force apparently was that it would relieve the Railway Police of the tiresome duties of chowkidars and that they would simply deal with reports of crime and disorders that were brought to their notice by the railway administration. In his opinion the Watch and Ward and Crime and Order forces should be amalgamated for the purpose of protecting the property of the public while that property was in the charge of the Railway. There were only two possible remedies for the present hopeless situation (1) that the Railway Police should take over the duties of the Watch and Ward or (2) that the Railway Police should be abolished and the Railway Companies should be empowered to appoint their own Police under their own officers who should be invested with magisterial powers. He favoured the second alternative.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, was of opinion that the Watch and Ward establishment should be under or subject to traffic control. The present system had worked as satisfactorily as and more smoothly than when the duties were carried out by the Railway Police.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, stated that the present system had worked well. One of the difficulties experienced was the total absence of any co-operation from the side of the Police. He did not think it would be advantageous to place the Watch and Ward under the Police. The force should be on the basis of the Police arrangements but placed under the head of the Traffic Department. Jemadars should be appointed of the same rank as Sub-Inspectors and Supervisors of the same rank as Inspectors. The latter should be invested with committing powers to the Magistrate without any interference from the Police as in the case of Excise Officers. If the Watch and Ward were placed under the head of the Traffic Department, Station Masters would be afforded every facility to represent matters to their officers. Under his system the Watch and Ward would be under the supervision of the Station Master so far as their duties were concerned. The Supervisors would see that a sufficient number of men were obtained and that their duties were properly arranged. There was no necessity to place the Supervisor actually under the Station Master and there was no objection to his being independent but he should work in co-operation with the Station Master. At present Police Inspectors did not care for the opinions of Station Masters. If, however, the Police Force was also placed under the head of the Railway, all Departments would work together.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, considered that the system of having the Watch and Ward under the Traffic Department as at present organized was unsatisfactory. The obvious defects of the system were:—(i) The Traffic Department and its Watch and Ward section could only deal with cases departmentally or report to the Police. They had no power to arrest a thief. Even if a watchman saw a wagon being robbed, he could only report to the Police and could not take any action. Watchmen could not arrest a man with a package believed to be railway property. They could only take such cases to a police officer. (ii) Duplication, i.e., the Police in the interest of Law and Order guarded areas also guarded by the Watch and Ward. (iii) Watchmen were recruited from a class upon whom suspicion was most likely to fall, and were usually employed in their native locality. Watchmen were of the same type as other railway menials.

For further remarks, see reply to question 19.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, considered that the system of having the Watch and Ward establishment under the Traffic Department was only partially satisfactory.

The Watch and Ward as constituted lacked authority. One remedy was a *liaison* with the Police. Some method should be found to give them powers such as the Police had. They would have those powers if placed under a Superintendent of Police. He had had experience of both systems in the Bombay Presidency, namely, the dual system in which the Watch and Ward as well as Law and Order were under the Police and the present system under which Watch and Ward was a separate force under the Traffic Department. The latter system was much more efficient as Watch and Ward, but not so effective as its powers were limited to the physical act of watching. The present working of the Watch and Ward was better than when it was under the Police, because under the dual system a roadside station had frequently only one police constable to cover both duties for the 24 hours. Now that the Watch and Ward were under the Traffic Department men did twelve hours' work at a stretch.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, suggested that the Watch and Ward should form part of the Traffic Department, but should not be under the direct control of the Station Master. They were not as independent of the Station Master as they should be. The Watch and Ward should be under their own Inspectors. Either the whole Watch and Ward should be entrusted to the Railway Police, the Superintendent of which should be a whole-time officer under the Agent, or the Railway should have their own Police Department doing all the work. Formerly, there was a system under which Prosecuting Inspectors controlled the whole of the Watch and Ward establishment at all stations, which had worked well. Station Masters at present had authority to insist that the Watch and Ward should pay attention to their orders, but they had not the power of punishment. He had never heard of cases where the Station Masters employed members of the Watch and Ward for their private work. If the Watch and Ward were placed under their own Inspectors it would mean that each Inspector would have about 30 stations to control, and it would not be possible for him to watch every station every day. The Watch and Ward were afraid of the Station Master, and if anything wrong was committed by him or his own men, that would not be brought to light under the present system.

Mr. White, Station Master, Gantakal, did not think that the system of having the Watch and Ward under the Traffic Department worked satisfactorily. The principal defects were the inferior class of men at present employed, and the inadequacy of the staff. At some stations men had to work a night shift of 12 hours for a fortnight before coming on day duty for a week, which resulted in them being frequently found asleep on duty and paved the way for thefts. He suggested that two shifts should work at night, each taking duty for 6 hours.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, considered that the present system was satisfactory. Unless the Watch and Ward were directly under the supervision of the Station Master the work could not be done. The Station Master was on the spot and was thus in a position to control the Watch and Ward, and to extract work from them. Special Inspectors might be appointed to recruit members of the Watch and Ward, but they would not be able to get work done by them. It was essential that the Watch and Ward should remain under the Station Master.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Logan, Agent, would prefer to keep the Watch and Ward under the Traffic Department under present conditions.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, would prefer to do away with watchmen and appoint constables instead; but as the Traffic Department dealt with claims and made payments for losses due to thefts while goods were under the charge of watchmen and as the only disciplinary measure that appealed to these men was a fine or a debit on account of claims, it would not be desirable to withdraw the watchmen from the Traffic Department on that account alone. It was also questionable whether the constables in the Railway Police, if they knew that they would be drafted at certain periods during their service to Watch and Ward duty on railways, would be willing to join the Police, but if they were willing to do so, it might be advantageous to post constables as watchmen for periods not exceeding six months at stations, after which they should revert to their ordinary Police duty, other constables replacing them. The difficulty in working such a scheme would rise in exercising discipline. The Traffic Department would report to the Superintendent of Railway Police any dereliction of duty which in addition to any punishment that might be inflicted should result in their removal from Watch and Ward duty. His idea was that if the Watch and Ward were not put under the Traffic Department they should be put under the Superintendent of Railway Police, who would be the head of a Railway Department. He should have charge not only of the Railway Police but of the Watch and Ward. Such an arrangement would tend to work being efficiently done.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, thought that the present system worked fairly satisfactorily having regard to existing conditions. The staff had to be appointed from men available locally, whose petty jealousies and village factions played a great part in the discharge of the duties allotted to them, resulting in loss of goods, etc. He suggested that the Superintendent of Police should be the head of a Railway Department and that the Watch and Ward should be amalgamated with the Police under his charge. A better class

of men should be recruited. They should be transferred periodically and should be armed at places where thefts were very prevalent. Those travelling with goods trains on sections where train thefts were prevalent should also be armed under proper supervision to safeguard themselves and also the property entrusted to their care.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, considered that the Watch and Ward arrangements under the Traffic Department had worked fairly satisfactorily. He was in favour of the Watch and Ward, not only in the Traffic but in all the Departments, being placed under the Police or amalgamated with the Police, provided that the Railway Police Superintendent was seconded and transferred to the Railway.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, thought that the present arrangements were satisfactory except that the staff should be under the control of the Traffic Inspectors of their respective districts so that they could be transferred when necessary. The men on night duty should be armed with some weapon such as a spear as he had had cases of the Watch and Ward being attacked.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, thought that the present system was fairly satisfactory but could be improved. The defects were that the present salary of watchmen was too low and once a man entered the railway he had nothing to look forward to in the shape of promotion until he left the service. Such an arrangement naturally induced a tendency to pilferage. The number of watchmen should be increased and their salaries should be graded to a time scale.

Mr. Ramachandra Aiyer, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, thought that the present system was satisfactory.

East Indian Railway.

Mr. Hindley, Agent, stated that considering the large amount spent on the Watch and Ward better results should be looked for and it was necessary that the whole organization should be put on a better footing. Further, the great increase in claims paid from 3.6 lakhs in 1910 to 10.2 lakhs in the half year ending 30th September 1920 showed a *prima facie* need for improvement in both Watch and Ward and Police. It was necessary to introduce better methods of recruitment and discipline and to strengthen the supervising staff. He advocated that the whole of the Watch and Ward staff should be placed under a staff of supervising officers and subordinates working as a separate Railway Department. At the head of this Branch there should be a trained police officer who would be employed by the Railway and might work at first under the General Traffic Manager. Without expert Police knowledge to guide the Railway officials in business of this nature, he did not think much could be obtained; but to meet this difficulty he would like to have the services of a fairly senior Superintendent of Police lent to the Railway for about six months in order to organize the new Department. It was probable that considerable economies might be effected in re-arranging the distribution of the Watch and Ward staff and in clearly defining their duties and their relations to the work of other Departments of the Railway. The police officer while on special duty in this connection would doubtless be able to give the railway valuable advice in the way of improving the present methods of safeguarding goods while in the hands of the railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that the system of having the Watch and Ward establishment under the Traffic Department worked satisfactorily where the men were drawn from the class of pensioned sepoys and policemen. They came to the railway with experience, a sense of discipline and responsibility and were amenable to order and control. The defects of having the men under the control of the Traffic Department were that they were ordinary servants and could not be punished except by fines and loss of service for neglect or careless Watch and Ward resulting in losses, nor could they be prosecuted for thefts while in their charge unless such thefts could be brought home to them. As a remedial measure he suggested that the men might be brought under the same controlling act as the Police.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, thought that the system was not satisfactory inasmuch as the staff had only powers to arrest a man and hand him over to the Station Master who in turn handed him over to the Police. He considered that the Watch and Ward staff should form part of the Police Staff. All that a chowkidar was able to do was to watch a man. He could not take any detective action himself. The result was that the chowkidar's action was dependent entirely on what view the Police took of it. If he were a police constable there was more probability of conviction. He would obtain a certain amount of credit and would have something to work for. At present a watchman received no encouragement and had nothing to work for. Even if he caught a man the Police could discharge him on the ground of insufficient evidence. The Station Master could not supervise the Watch and Ward at all times. He was not on duty at night. The Assistant Station Master who was on duty could not spare the time to supervise. If the whole Watch and Ward staff were made over entirely to the Police the work would be more satisfactorily done. Such an arrangement would not lead to friction between the Police and the Railway staff.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, stated that if it was possible so to organize the Police establishment that it was placed under Railway control he would be in favour of the Watch and Ward staff being taken over by the Police, but if the Police

arrangements were to continue as at present he was not in favour of the transfer. He considered that the ordinary Watch and Ward staff was as reliable as the Police and therefore the one was a good set off against the other. The defects were that the men generally engaged were local men and consequently were not inclined to act against their friends. The number of chowkidars employed was insufficient adequately to guard goods sheds and wagons in large areas. By placing the Watch and Ward under the Police the power of the Police Sub-Inspector would be increased and trouble would arise between Station Masters and Sub-Inspectors which even now was not infrequently the case. It was no doubt more appropriate that the Watch and Ward should look for recognition of their good work to the Police than to the Station Master, but at the same time if there was a totally inadequate police force as at present they could not cope with the work. The Police themselves frequently admitted that they were unable to do all their work. Railway Police Officers also were often taken away for other duties. To say that it was in the nature of the Police to encourage good work in the way of detection and on the other hand it was in the nature of the station staff to discourage it, was going too far. The Station Master was not half so bad as he was depicted to be. If he was an active man he discouraged malpractices on the part of his staff. Those evils only flourished when the Station Master was slack.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, stated that the present system was satisfactory.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, Mokameh Ghat, stated that the system was satisfactory so long as the Watch and Ward staff was left entirely alone by the Police.

Babu Kalka Pershad, Station Master, Jammu Bridge, stated that the system of having the Watch and Ward establishment under the Traffic Department had worked satisfactorily, but the present staff was insufficient and the pay was also poor. The force should be occasionally supervised by a special officer, say a Watch and Ward Inspector, at surprise inspections. At present they were only supervised by the Station Master but he had not sufficient time to devote to supervision. More Watch and Ward staff was necessary at road side stations. At present they were only maintained at large stations where there was a large amount of goods traffic.

Mr. Harris, Goods Superintendent, was in favour of having one Chowkidari Department which would run the chowkidari system of all Departments. It should be placed under one head with the same legal powers as the Police, but should be under the administration of the Railway. It should be sub-divided as follows :—(1) Watch and Ward Branch, (2) Detective Branch, (3) Enquiry Branch.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismail, General Traffic Manager, was of opinion that the Watch and Ward establishment should remain under the Traffic Department with the present system of Railway Provincial Police in force. Under that system the railway authorities could deal with the staff direct which they could not do if they were under the Police. He thought that any system under which the Station Master would have no power over the Watch and Ward would not work. It was necessary that the local authority should be vested in the Station Master. Even now the Station Master could not punish. He could only recommend *vide* Traffic Rules. He did not think there was much strength in the argument that in matters in which the Watch and Ward were implicated the Station Master would not report them.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Coates, Agent, thought that the present system was satisfactory.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, considered that the system had worked satisfactorily. He was not in favour of the suggestion that there should be a separate branch for the Watch and Ward or that they should be removed from the control of the Station Master and should have their own Inspectors. "The Station Master is the man on the spot and is the proper person to be in charge." If another organization were set up jealousy and dissension would arise—in fact the same kind of trouble that was at present experienced between the Traffic Department and the Railway Police. The weight of goods carried had increased considerably in recent years but the Watch and Ward staff had not increased in the same proportion.

Mr. Minahan, Transportation Inspector, thought that the system had worked satisfactorily. The defects lay in the class of men appointed. Old retired soldiers should not be appointed as they were physically unfit for the duties required of them. The men employed were useless and in his opinion, they were, if not the actual thieves, at any rate very often accessories. The salary of a watchman was Rs. 11 and for every vacancy that occurred there were at least a dozen applicants although they could earn from Rs. 22 to Rs. 25 per mensem in the Mills next door by working five days a week. He suggested the appointment of Gurkhas or Lathials.

Mr. Denkh, Station Master, Santahar, saw no advantage in removing the staff from the control of the Station Master. The men were underpaid and were therefore liable to be bought over.

Babu I. M. Das, Station Master, Serajganj, considered that the present system was satisfactory.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

Mr. Nolan, Agent, stated that the system, generally speaking, worked satisfactorily, and he saw no alternative other than the undesirable one of reverting to the old practice of placing the Watch and Ward staff directly under the Police. If the Railway Police were imperialized the machinery of that service might be employed to recruit and train men suitable for Watch and Ward service. They might in fact be supplied from the less efficient recruits trained for the Imperial Railway Police Service itself.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, mentioned that such trouble as had arisen from time to time had been due to the failure to secure the desired class of men.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, remarked that the only defects were due to neglect of duty which was contingent to most bodies of men.

Mr. Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Commercial, thought that if the orders were carried out the system was satisfactory.

Mr. James, Supervising Station Master, Chandpur, stated that the system in force was satisfactory if carried out correctly and under strict supervision.

Babu S. M. Ghosh, Station Master, Gauhati, agreed.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Doalth, Traffic Manager, considered that the present system was as satisfactory as could be expected under the present conditions. With a better class of men, better supervision, and more efficient organization, better results would be obtained. Proposals had been made from time to time in recent years to re-organize the Watch and Ward staff, but owing to the war and conditions since, the Railway had not been in a position to make any great reform or re-organization. A better class of men was required and better supervision should be provided by appointing a certain number of Inspectors like Passenger Superintendents, who were retired Indian officers. He was opposed to the Police taking over the control of the Watch and Ward because difficulties would arise. If the chowkidars were under the Police they would not listen to the Station Master; under the Traffic Department they were bound to obey the Station Master and to carry out his orders. This arrangement conduced to efficiency. A separate department independent of Police control and co-operating with the Traffic Department would, however, be satisfactory. It should be organized on the lines of the Railway Traffic Department.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, thought that the system was satisfactory, but could be improved by (1) enlisting disciplined *ex-sepoys* or reservists, (2) direct supervision by goods clerks and station masters, (3) appointment at large stations, like Karachi City where there were 50 chowkidars, of Indian officers who would be responsible that the Watch and Ward staff carried out its duties properly. It was difficult to expect a chief goods clerk or Station Master with an unlimited amount of work on hand properly to supervise the Watch and Ward. The present defect was that a man was picked up from the street, sent to the goods shed and told: "You are a chowkidar now; this is your beat, carry on." He was not trained and was hardly able to appreciate his responsibilities. A central training school would turn out the right stamp of men. A regular Department for the Watch and Ward under the Deputy Traffic Manager with proper officers would be a distinct improvement on the present arrangement. He was certain that officers could not supervise the Watch and Ward as at present organized.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, Lahore, considered that the Watch and Ward should remain under the Traffic Department, but that the system should be improved by increasing the staff, shortening the hours of duty and providing better supervision. The men and the Jemadars should be recruited from the *ex-sepoy* class.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, thought that the system was on the whole satisfactory. There were, however, some places where special arrangements existed and where armed Railway Police watched yards and loaded wagons jointly with the Railway chowkidars.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, Karachi, considered that the present arrangement of having the Watch and Ward establishment under the Traffic Department was a mistake. The defects were (1) low wages, and (2) defective supervision. He suggested that the chowkidars should be brought under the control of the Railway Police. Under such a scheme, however, Station Masters at large stations ought still to have some control over chowkidars and he would invest them with the power of giving orders to chowkidars, for instance, the locking up of godowns or the watching of any particular consignments or wagon. He admitted that there was always trouble where there was a system of divided control. A system which would make the Watch and Ward a separate Railway Department with their own officers would not work because the separate Department could not co-operate with the Traffic Department. A better arrangement would be to make the Watch and Ward separate branch of the Traffic Department.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, was of opinion that the Watch and Ward staff should remain under the Traffic Department. The system did not work satisfactorily as a whole for want of better organization. There should be a Jemadar in charge of a batch of 6 to 8 chowkidars and he should come on duty with his batch for 6 hours during which time he would be employed in constantly visiting his posts to see that his men were on the alert and carrying out orders. Head Jemadars should be appointed at large stations where a large number of chowkidars was employed. Want of supervision and control made chowkidars indifferent or gave them opportunities to take advantage of their position. They should be better paid, as they could be made the means of saving the railway a great deal of money.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyleraud, stated that the system of Watch and Ward under the Traffic Department was necessary but would work more satisfactorily if the duties of chowkidars were reduced from 12 to 8 hours a day. The only effect of the present system was that owing to chowkidars being made to work 12 hours a day in two periods with 6 hours interval of rest between the two they did not and could not hold on satisfactorily. The greater portion of their leisure hours was spent in cooking food and attending to their household affairs while the remaining time did not give them sufficient rest to be fit enough to turn up for efficient duty. It was necessary also that at stations where Chowkidari Jemadars were provided that their numbers should be increased so that one Jemadar should always be on duty.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Colonel Izat, Agent, stated that owing to the rights reserved by Government of using the Railway Police as a part of the general means of preserving the public peace and preventing crime, the Police force was solely subject to authority outside the Railway in all matters connected with appointment, promotion, rewards, discipline, punishments and transfers, and on that account he did not recommend that the Watch and Ward establishment should be supplied by the Police. The Traffic Manager would eagerly accept the assistance and advice of the Police Superintendent in the appointment of the Watch and Ward staff, but he must have full control over them.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, was of opinion that the present system was satisfactory and that under outside control the system would become impossible. He did not think there would be sufficient justification on the Bengal and North-Western Railway for instituting a regular Watch and Ward service under gazetted officers with local Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors and Jemadars who would be independent of the Station Masters and Goods Clerks. Better results could not be obtained than were being obtained now. Station Masters had a hold over the Watch and Ward. If the Station Master, however, was himself a thief, nothing would stop thefts and pilferages at his station. The proposal to place the Watch and Ward under the Police was one which brushed aside the very objection which the Police themselves had raised against imperialization—the duality of control and by the introduction of an alien authority at stations little could be hoped for beyond an increase of trouble and probably of extortion. Chowkidars set up independently at stations would almost certainly regard themselves as chowkidars over the station staff as well as on public property with results that would be easily anticipated.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, did not think that any other system was possible. It was obvious that the men must be under the direct control of the Department that dealt with the establishment. It was a considerable help to the District Officer in dealing with the Watch and Ward staff to be able to gauge the work of the staff by means of the number of claims arising and thefts and shortages reported from a station.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, considered that the present system was satisfactory and did not think that the proposal to remove the Watch and Ward from their present control and to establish a separate Department would work satisfactorily. It was essential that the Watch and Ward should be controlled by the Station Master. They were afraid of him and his control was beneficial. At Sonapur where there was a headquarters Police Inspector and a Sub-Inspector the Watch and Ward if placed under the Police would perhaps perform their duties properly but at roadside stations where there was no one of their own Department to watch them they would not take so much interest in their work.

Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapraz, considered the system satisfactory. The establishment must be in the hands of the Department which was responsible for the receipt and delivery of goods and which could deal with irregularities and slackness at once. If the Watch and Ward staff belonged to another Department it would take a long time to bring home the slackness of its staff to the officers and to remedy defects. It was essential that the defects in the Watch and Ward working should be remedied at once. Considering the enormous amount of work done the complaints that occasionally arose appeared inevitable. With improved supervision complaints would greatly decrease. If the entire work with which the Watch and Ward was connected were in the hands of the Police the arrangement suggested would be satisfactory, but the handling of goods was under the Traffic Department and chowkidars working under a separate Department would not listen to the Station Master. At small stations chowkidars had to do a great deal in addition to their own Watch and Ward duties: for instance, marking of goods. The Station Master could not attend to marks and such matters. The chowkidars attended to it. They sometimes did the loading under the direct

instructions of the Station Master. These were not the recognised duties of the Watch and Ward but work would not be possible without imposing these duties on them.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, considered that in the case of small stations retention of the Watch and Ward establishment under the control of the Traffic Department was the only feasible system as it was essential that such employees should be under the direct supervision and control of the Station Master. It was probable, however, that at large stations at which Railway Police were maintained that an improvement would result from co-ordinating the Railway chowkidars with the Railway Police under the supervision and control of the Sub-Inspector. Separation of the force entirely from the control of the Station Masters at large stations would ensure better control and better discipline. He did not consider that there would be any difficulty in divesting the Station Master of his control.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Claims Inspector, considered the present system satisfactory.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, agreed, but recommended that provision for "Busy Season Establishment" should be made because at such times hundreds of loaded wagons stood in the yard and the number of Watch and Ward staff was quite inadequate to deal with them.

Pundit Amrit Lal Tewari, Station Master, Budaan, thought the present system satisfactory.

Question No. 5.—What is the system :—

- (a) of checking goods at time of loading, unloading and transshipment ;
- (b) of supervising the staff employed in handling goods ;
- (c) of fastening and sealing wagons ;
- (d) of seal checking, and
- (e) of guarding loaded wagons in yards and on running trains.

Do you consider the systems in force satisfactory ?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, described the system as follows :—

(a) At the time of loading a clerk is allotted for each wagon who stands at the door of the wagon and sees to the condition of each article or bag as it comes in. Unsound bags are thrown aside and those thus thrown aside are collected and reweighed and their condition noted. After the wagon has been loaded a copy of the invoice is put into the wagon which is then locked and sealed.

(b) Supervision of the staff employed in handling goods is exercised by the Station Master at smaller stations and by the goods clerk assisted by the loading clerk at big goods sheds. Station Masters have the loading and unloading contract. Rates are fixed at so much a thousand maunds and the Station Master sends in his bill monthly.

(c) At smaller stations labels fastened by string and sealing wax marked with the station's seals are used. Wire and lead seals are now being introduced at the larger stations. Top fasteners are fixed now on most wagons which are also provided with cotters and iron keys or wedges.

(d) After the sealing has been done the seal is examined by the Watch and Ward staff after which the head transshipment clerk or the trains clerk examines how many wagons are loaded and how many remain empty. When the train is made up the guard checks it. Under the present system the checking is left to the ignorant and illiterate Watch and Ward. At engine-changing stations, roughly every 100 miles, the seals are examined by the Police, the Watch and Ward staff and the number-taker. If any seal has been broken or tampered with a report is at once made to the Station Master who causes a re-check of the contents of the wagon to be made in the presence of the Police.

(e) In the yards the Watch and Ward staff are on guard ; on running trains neither the Police nor the Watch and Ward are ordinarily employed, only the guard being responsible.

Mr. Harvey, Agent, referring to (c) stated that he did not think that anything had been done on the resolution passed at the Railway Conference of 1919 regarding certain proposals for the locking of goods wagons. Experiments had been made but nothing definite had been settled. The Railway was not in favour of the East Indian Railway locking arrangements. The objection to locking wagons with ordinary padlocks was that each train would thus have 60 keys to carry along. They would have to be kept in the guard's vans and handed over to another guard, when there was a change. If a wagon had to be detached the key would have to be handed over to the Station Master concerned. The system would prove impracticable. If a master key were adopted the thieves would adopt it within three days.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, referring to (c) stated that the Railway preferred the old East Indian Railway wagon lock as a preventive for running train thefts—that is, the long hinged hook which was held in position by a bolt under the fulcrum which could only be opened after a man had climbed on to the roof and unlocked it. Not much was being done at the present time in the matter of wagon locks. With the free interchange of broad gauge wagons throughout India and the deterioration of stock following on the war it was all that the Carriage and Wagon Departments could do to keep wagons in running order without attending to special fittings.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, referring to (b), stated that Station Masters were given the handling contract. The system had been working satisfactorily. It was not a fact that Station Masters employed coolies on less wages on the understanding that they would make good the deficit by pilferage. Referring to (d) he stated that after wagons had been sealed and left in the yard they were checked at six hours' interval by the Watch and Ward staff when each batch was relieved. The Watch and Ward were capable of checking seals so far as the fact whether the seals were intact or not was concerned, but when there was a question of the impression on the seal they were not capable.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, referring to (a) and (b), thought that the clerks checking goods and supervising the staff did their work carefully because they were too frightened of getting shortages reported against their station which meant heavy debits. Referring to (b) he stated that Station Masters were given the handling contract. Railway stations were divided into three classes: (a), (b) and (c). At a large station like Bareilly where there was very heavy handling work done Station Masters were paid at a lower rate. At small stations where very little handling was done and there was difficulty in obtaining labour they received a higher rate. The rates were fixed at so much a thousand maunds and the Station Master sent in his bill monthly which was then checked by the Audit Department and the amount due paid out. With reference to the suggestion that this system led to a great deal of dishonesty, that is to say, that Station Masters under-paid their men in order to make profit for themselves, and that this was done on the understanding that palladars would be able to make a certain amount by pilfering, he did not think that such was the fact. Where the Station Master made his profit was probably by not having the full number of men necessary. When merchants did what was called direct loading such direct loading was all to the profit of the Station Master. Referring to (c) he stated that top fasteners were fixed on most wagons. Wagons were also provided with cotters or iron keys or wedges. There was no delay in sealing. Wagons were not kept unsealed at night even if not completely loaded. Referring to (d) he stated that clerks went round the trains and checked wagons after the sealing was done. Further, the guards also checked all seals before the train left a starting station or when a wagon was detached at a roadside station. The time at his disposal was sufficient to do this. A constable and a watchman generally accompanied him. All three signed a joint certificate stating that seals were intact. With reference to the suggestion that constables and watchmen were not really competent to detect a seal which had been tampered with, he thought that they could detect most tampered or false seals, but that it would be difficult for them to detect a case where the string had been cut behind the label and then joined together again. There was difficulty in being able to get up to the seal because that involved climbing up. Referring to (e) he thought that it would be better if the Railway Watch and Ward staff took over the patrolling of running trains.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Bara Banki, stated that he was the handling contractor for his station. Goods that were loaded privately were deducted from goods that were loaded by the Railway. There were two columns in the register: one for goods handled by the Station Master and the other for goods handled by the owner; from the totals of the two figures a deduction was made and the Station Master was then paid according to the number of maunds handled. In making such payments the Railway followed the market rate of labour. The rate was Re. 1-8 per thousand maunds when he took charge, but since then the rate had been raised to Rs. 3-2. His monthly bill amounted to Rs. 900; out of this he had to maintain 30 men, if the traffic was heavy, and if the traffic was slack then not less than 40, who had to be paid whether they worked or not. When payment was made thumb impressions of the payees were taken in the register. Men were paid once a month and the register was periodically examined by the Deputy Traffic Manager in charge of the Commercial Section. Referring to (c) he stated that "the present system of sealing is merely a trust on card paper which has been abused considerably." Shortages could only be avoided by introducing a system of patent locking and doing away with sealing. Such an arrangement would save the Railway thousands and thousands of rupees on claims. There were certain locking apparatus on the East Indian Railway which could not easily be broken and which should be introduced on this Railway. Referring to (d) he stated that there should be independent checking by the superior staff and not by the Watch and Ward who were generally illiterate men and could not detect anything unusual.

Mr. O'Connor, Station Superintendent, Lucknow, referring to (c), stated that top-fasteners were effective in preventing crime. It was possible to pilfer from sealed wagons with long sticks and easy to steal from wagons with manholes.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, described the systems as follows:—

- (a) Goods are checked by loading and unloading foremen under the supervision of Goods Clerks or Station Masters.
- (b) Supervision is exercised by Goods Clerks or Station Masters.
- (c) Seals are affixed after loading by sealers under the supervision of the loader.
- (d) Seals are checked by number-takers and guards on taking over and making over of wagons. On some parts of the line, the police are present at this operation.
- (e) All large yards have special Watch and Ward staff. Running trains have only the train staff to guard them except when in the large yards.

Mr. Rabbott, Agent, referring to (a) thought that on the whole the loading and unloading was properly supervised. (b) The handling was done partly by Company's labour and partly by Contractor's labour, the contract in the latter case being taken at some stations by a contractor and at others by the station master. Before the Indian Midland Railway was amalgamated, station masters used to receive the contracts for such labour and that system still obtained at small stations. Now, on the Great Indian Peninsula section, the Company employed its own labour. Personally he preferred to appoint his own labour but had found that it was the most expensive. He did not think that the contract system led to pilferage. In this respect, there was not much to choose between the two systems. He thought that most of the pilferages were due almost entirely to the peculiar conditions under which traffic was dealt with at the present time. During the last few years, the economic conditions of the country had been such that the lower classes had resorted to thieving. Referring to (c) he stated that the less the number of fastenings there were the better, because there were then less things on a wagon to aid a thief in climbing on to it. Defects in this respect had been removed in the later wagon designs. He had no faith in top-fasteners. As often as not, they were not used, and a man could easily get on to a wagon and raise them. The only Railway as far as he knew, that had adopted the system was the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway. A satisfactory lock had not yet been devised. The only lock of any value at present was the ordinary pad-lock. The Railway had been experimenting with a device invented by one of their own engineers, but it was only useful where only two stations, for example, Dhond and Baramati, were concerned. It was a letter lock which would not do on a big railway system, where break-downs between stations might take place. The difficulty with ordinary locks was that the master-key would have to be given to every one concerned which would defeat the object of locking. He would like to find some lock that was an integral part of a wagon. Referring to (d) he stated that seal-checking by the Police had been discontinued on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway for some years. He did not think that seal-checking would be any better done if it were done by the Police. It would only mean adding another man to do one man's work. The Railway held the number-taker and the guard responsible for the condition of seals. On the whole they did the work fairly efficiently. Guards were fully alive to the importance of checking their trains satisfactorily.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated with reference to (a) to (d), that the systems in force were generally satisfactory, but with regard to (e) the present conditions pointed to increased staff being required in yards and to police protection for running trains.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, considered that the systems in force were generally satisfactory, except that enough protection was not afforded to (e) wagons on running trains from which goods were being systematically robbed between Igatpuri and Bhusawal.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, thought that in normal times the systems were satisfactory, but this could not be said of the systems at present.

Mr. Flynn, Goods Superintendent, Wadi Bunder, stated with reference to (b) that all loading work was done by the Company's hamals, but unloading work was entirely done by contractors, Messrs. Fakirji, Rustomjee and Sons on behalf of the Company. Loading hooks were forbidden but the coolies would not work without them. No merchant ever came to the booking shed for delivery. The work was done by carting agents. Goods were tendered by *dalals* on behalf of merchants. Every package of "smalls" was marked. This was the only shed in India where it was done. If it were done everywhere it would save a large number of claims arising from misdespatch, or overcarriage and thousands of telegrams of reference. Referring to (c) he stated that the custom of merchants putting on their own locks was growing. In the case of a hot axle or other mishap the Railway broke the lock and removed the goods.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, considered with reference to (b) that the supervision required while goods were being handled was such as suggested in his reply to question 3, namely, old military pensioners of the rank of non-commissioned officers.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, stated with reference to (c) that the safest wagons were the East Indian Railway and the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway wagons which were secured from the roof. Referring to (e) he stated that the number of watchmen allotted to guard wagons in the yard was insufficient. Police in plain clothes should do this work which should be made a part of their regular duty. He wanted the Police more for the purpose of detection than for the purpose of prevention. On running trains, guards and brakesmen were responsible and at halts they patrolled trains. There were, however, certain stations and places known to the running staff where thieves attacked trains, and if the staff showed themselves, they were pelted with stones; at such places the staff shut themselves in the brake, and if at roadside stations made off to the station. He suggested that armed Police should travel by trains on portions of the line which were considered dangerous.

Rao Sahab G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, thought that the systems in force were satisfactory. Referring to (d) he suggested that the police should check seals at all engine-changing stations.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Tyld, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, described the systems as follows:—

(a) Merchants having goods for despatch bring them on to the scales where they are sealed by the station clerk, who is responsible for making an examination of the condition of the package. If any defects are found, a note are detected, the sender is called upon to examine one. Little or no difficulty is experienced in making a mark upon the package when the sender is satisfied that the condition of the package requires it. The sealing clerk also makes a note upon packages and any omission of the weighing clerk is rectified by him. There is a sealing clerk for each station, i.e. about every three wagons. The dates on both these clerks are supervised by the shed-foreman. As a rule, the check on their work surprises clerks of loaded and sealed wagons as made by the shed-foreman's small card which is used to verify the correctness of the contents and condition of goods loaded in the wagon. Any irregularity noticed is taken up with the clerk concerned. If the irregularity is a serious one, the clerk is handed over to the Traffic Superintendent to be dealt with. In the case of inward goods the sealing of the contents of each wagon is conducted by a separate clerk who is responsible for the integrity and correctness of the number of goods received. His work is then checked by the delivery section clerk who is responsible for maintaining a correct record of work in the inward goods clerk. Carnac bridge is a terminal station; consequently no transshipment work is done.

(b) The clerks unloading goods are supervised by senior clerks and they in their turn are supervised by the yard or shed-foreman. Any heavy pilferage or serious shortage is reported to the shed-foreman, who then reports to the senior clerk or foreman and the necessary remarks are passed on the unloading sheet and the sealing and fastening and transshipment stations, if any, are advised by wire. The loading contractor receives Rs. 1-5 per head per train and pays the amount in full.

(c) On the loading of a wagon being complete, the loading clerk places bracket labels with particulars of contents in the bracket and then fixes the door labels to the label rings on the wagon doors and the labels are sealed by a senior man in his presence.

(d) On the arrival of a train on the main line, the condition of the seals on wagons is checked by two watchmen, one on each side of the train, supervised by a train clerk and another four or five men on the observation of the guard and the yard-shunting master. The latter enters the guard's signature for any defect and reports the same.

(e) Inward loaded wagons are watched by watchmen detailed for such work.

Mr. Tyld, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that efficient clerks and proper supervision alone made the system satisfactory.

Mr. Peckey, General Traffic Manager, referring to (c) stated that railways had devised a large number of locks, but so far a really satisfactory one had not been invented, because none of them was an integral part of the wagon. Nearly all the locks invented required keys, which meant that unless all railways adopted the same lock, a large number of keys would be required at every station. The essential condition of any satisfactory locking arrangement was that it should be an integral part of the wagon. It should be capable of being opened and locked without outside implements. A weak feature of the ordinary letter lock was that once the key-word was known it became useless. The overhead locking arrangement in use on the East Indian Railway was not employed on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway. There were some advantages in that form of locking which made it necessary for the thief to get above the sky line and also because he had to climb up, which was not an easy task. He thought, however, that the locks should be operated from underneath the wagon, so that when the train was in motion, the thief could not open it. The Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway had been locking and riveting their wagons. There had been a decrease in the number of thefts reported since this precaution had been adopted. Referring to (e) he stated that although he had no figures, he thought that matters had improved since the Railway Police had been removed from the Watch and Ward work and the railway staff employed in their place.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, referring to (a) and (b), stated that the chief goods clerk at Baroda received about Rs. 165 a month and the loader about Rs. 75. Goods clerks received on an average Rs. 40 to Rs. 70 and stationmasters Rs. 75 to Rs. 120. Referring to (b) he stated that at some stations, the handling was done by contractors and at others by railway labour. At his station railway labour was employed. Referring to (c) he stated that only the string and sealing wax system was employed. Referring to (d) he stated that in the case of running trains seals were checked at the starting point, at every engine-changing station and again on arrival at destination. The police did not do any seal checking at his station. Referring to (e) he stated that the police did not do any patrolling in his yard. If 2 or 3 men were placed on watch near the distant signal at each station, about 60 men would be required for each section which consisted of 15 to 20 stations. He thought it would be more advantageous to have train guards on each train, who would escort the train throughout their section and would hand it over to the relief at the commencement of a new section.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, explained the system as follows:—

(a) The system of checking goods at the time of loading, unloading and transshipment is by tally in a book maintained by the clerk appointed for the purpose.

(b) The supervision of the staff engaged in handling goods is by tally clerks. In large sheds the work of those clerks is supervised by senior men.

(c) The fastening of wagons is done by a bolt. The sealing is done by means of wax, twine and a card.

(d) Wagon seals are checked by the police and watch and ward jointly at terminal and engine changing stations. Guards check the seals before trains leave the depot stations. On the whole the check is satisfactory, except in the case of seals cleverly tampered with.

(e) Loaded wagons in station yards are guarded by watch and ward. Running trains are in charge of guards.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, referring to (a) stated that the system was satisfactory, but the execution depended on the sense of duty of the staff. Referring to (b) he

stated that the success of the system again depended upon the sense of duty of the staff. Labour at some stations was Company, at others Contract. The latter system led to some corruption. (c) No satisfactory wagon lock had been devised. If a separate key were kept for each lock there would be delay if it were lost. As to a letter lock the combinations for the large stations would soon get known as so many people must know them up and down the line. The method of sealing wagons was as satisfactory as any other in force. (e) The system was fairly satisfactory. On certain notorious runs the police sent travelling constables on goods trains. At stations *en route* where police were posted they patrolled the train while it stood in the station. The problem was a difficult one. The guards had usually work to do on arrival at a wayside station, and with the present long trains an effective patrol at wayside stations was hardly practicable. Losses from running trains occurred in certain areas only and active police action in those areas appeared to be the only effective safeguard.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that the systems in force were satisfactory, subject to the limitations mentioned in his reply to question 4, *viz.*, the absence of power beyond "watching."

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, referring to (c) stated that watchmen took charge of wagons in yards. On running trains, the guard, under-guard and travelling constable, if on the train, did the watching. At stations where there were police stations or outposts, a constable made a check of seals on all passing trains, but this was usually a very casual check and shirked on the plea of want of time. He would have one or two travelling watchmen instead of a policeman as the latter did very little in the way of watching. In nearly every running train theft there had been a policeman on the train. He thought watchmen would be able to cope with organized thefts from running trains. That had been his experience in the past.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, considered the systems in force satisfactory except that where a sufficient number of police were employed, patrols should visit the yards at frequent intervals. These patrols should be under the orders of an officer not lower in rank than a Sub-Inspector who should immediately report any irregularity noticed to the station master on duty. The system of putting a policeman and traffic watchman together at a post was found not to work satisfactorily as in the case of thefts responsibility could not be fixed. To his knowledge, it was found that after the police were withdrawn, thefts and extractions had decreased to a considerable extent.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, stated that systems (c), (d) and (e) were not satisfactory. With reference to (c) he suggested that instead of fastening rings of doors by a piece of twine, a lead band should be passed through the rings and a lead seal put on with the station code in addition to the card-board. The cord of the present wax seal gave way while the train was in motion and the doors of wagons were oscillating. Lead seals could not be easily tampered with. He had not come across any cases in which sealing with the punch had not been properly done. With reference to (d) he thought that wagon seals should be checked at all stations where trains stopped for more than ten minutes by the guard and the police. With reference to (e) he stated that separate watch was required to guard the loaded wagons standing both day and night at heavy traffic stations and also on trains at least during the night in addition to the guard and brakeman.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, described the systems as follows:—

(a) As regards loading both owners' loads and sundry consignments are supposed to be checked with consignment notes and goods unloaded, similarly, with invoices. On the South Indian Railway the practice is for the invoices to accompany consignments. At certain larger stations there are warehouse books and goods tally books into which particulars from invoices and consignment notes are entered before unloading and loading. At transhipment stations goods are checked with invoices which on the South Indian Railway accompanied the goods and in the case of foreign consignments where the invoices do not accompany the goods they are checked with the junction invoices. Where owners load wagons at their private sidings, no check is as a rule made by the railway staff and invoices are granted with the remark "said to contain." In these cases owners affix their own seals in addition to railway seals.

(b) In regard to loading, at smaller stations where there are no goods clerks, the station master is supposed to supervise the loading and unloading of both owners' loads and sundry consignments. At stations where goods shed staff is maintained one of the clerks is told off to each duty and is known as the loading or unloading clerk. Similarly for transhipment one of the assistant tranship clerks supervises the transhipment of articles from one wagon to another. The actual work of handling is done in the case of sundry consignments and tranship goods by company's menials or contractor's coolies and in the case of owner's loads by the owner's own cartmen and coolies.

(c) The orders are as follows. Before goods are loaded into wagons the off doors as well as the side flap and trap doors and ventilators are properly secured. The off side of the wagon is also sealed with a view to prevent any interference on the off side of wagon during loading. The spaces, wagon number "from station to station," "date," on the seal card are then filled up, the other spaces being filled up immediately after the loading is completed. On completion of loading, the doors on the platform side are closed and the vertical bolt and bottom wedge are secured. All the prescribed entries in the blank spaces in the seal cards are then filled in legibly in ink in block letters by the clerk deputed to see to the loading. The seal cards are then attached to the wagons and sealed with the station seal in his presence.

(d) The orders are as follows. At certain stations the seals on both sides of all wagons detached from, attached to or passing by trains are examined immediately on arrival and just before the departure of trains by the guard and train clerk on duty with a view to seeing that they are in perfect order. They also see that the twine fastening them to the wagons has not been tampered with, *i.e.*, cut underneath the wax impression and retied or re-impregnated. At stations where railway police constables are stationed, they are required to make an independent check and report the result to their superiors. Guards when taking charge of or handing over sealed loads examine the seals on both sides to see if they are intact and do the same at each stopping station particularly at watering or other stations where trains halt for five minutes or more after dark.

(c) Where watchmen are employed, the patrol system is utilized and each watchman is allotted a certain area to guard, so that when shortages or thefts occur, responsibility can be easily fixed. The assistant station master on duty is expected to supervise at night whether the watchmen do their duty or not. At intermediate stations one of the station menials is deputed to patrol the off side of the train and the head-guard or fireman is held jointly responsible for safeguarding the train and the station master and the head guard are responsible for safeguarding the rear or the platform side. When a train is held up at the outer signal due to crossing or for other purposes, the station master or assistant station master on duty checks out in accordance with instructions such menials as can be spared to assist in guarding the train.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that the systems were satisfactory if the orders and instructions were carried out to the letter, and if the railway received the co-operation of the police. The trouble was that in many cases it was found that orders had not been strictly carried out, which pointed to the fact that supervision was not adequate. Referring to (c) he referred to models of two locks invented by Messrs. Pereira and Travers Philips and also the "F" type of wagon bolt. The idea underlying these three locks was that the bolts were fastened in the roof covering of the wagon and ladders had to be used to unbolt them. In the case of the Philips and Pereira locks, two men were required, one to release the fastening at the top and the other to withdraw the bolt. These locks made running train thefts practically impossible. So far no thefts had occurred from running trains or in station yards from wagons fitted with this particular type of bolt lock. The Railway had 94 "F" type wagons, 25 wagons fitted with Pereira lock and 15 wagons fitted with Philips lock. With reference to the co-operation of the Police he stated that a very large number of cases were reported as undetected or non-cognizable.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, considered that all the systems were satisfactory having regard to prevailing conditions. Referring to (d) seal checking, he stated that the police were required to make an independent check and report the result to their superiors. This was not a part of their prescribed duties, but was an arrangement made between the railway and the Superintendent of Police. He thought it was advantageous as it helped to localise thefts. Referring to (e), he stated that at 18 hours daily all wagons and sundry goods lying in the goods shed and tranship platforms were handed over to the charge of watchmen. Particulars of wagon numbers, the condition of seals and the number and description of packages on the platform were recorded in a book called the watchman's book, in which the watchmen signed in the presence of the persons handing over charge. On the following morning the clerk deputed to take over charge from the watchmen did so and if everything was correct signed the watchman's book in token thereof. Generally the larger yards were divided into areas, each of which was allotted to a watchman, who took over every wagon or package therein.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, thought that the systems in force were satisfactory. Referring to (e), he stated that at large stations the railway had special sealers, but at small stations the work was done by the usual station staff.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, thought that the systems in force were satisfactory except that (c) something should be done in the way of patent locking instead of relying on the sealing of wagons. He recommended a wagon lock invented by Mr. Patterson, Permanent Way Inspector.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, referring to (e), stated that the system was not satisfactory. Two constables fully armed should escort every goods train and should be made jointly responsible with the railway staff in the case of deficiencies. His intention in suggesting that the Police should be armed was that at least they might deter Kallars who frequently robbed trains.

Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, stated that the systems in force were satisfactory, but made the following suggestions; (1) Detention to inward goods at stations should be reduced to a minimum by enhancing the rate of demurrage and wharfage which would induce consignees to remove their goods earlier. (2) Under the existing system goods to be unloaded and loaded at the cost of owners were handled by private coolies in all important goods sheds. Among them were to be found *ex-convicts* and bad characters. Men of a similar type were also to be found among the large number of brokers who spent the whole day in the goods shed alleging that they were acting on behalf of merchants. The characters of all these coolies and brokers should be certified by the railway police and they should be given a licence by the railway to ply their respective businesses on deposit of such a reasonable fee as might be fixed by the administration. (3) The railway police should constantly patrol goods and transshipment sheds during both day and night and should have full power not only to exclude all undesirables but also to prosecute such as were persistent offenders. (4) Residential quarters, dispensaries and recreation rooms should be removed from goods shed premises.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, described the systems as follows :—

(a) At the time of loading the loader or a clerk specially deputed for the purpose stands at the door of the wagon generally and as packages to be loaded into the wagon are brought up by the coolies he examines them to see if they are in good condition and at the same time keeps a tally recording the marks on the packages. When the loading is completed or the wagon full the doors are immediately closed and sealed and also locked in addition to sealing in cases where there is a system of locking, *e.g.*, in the case of valuable traffic from Howrah and the jetties to Delhi and Cawnpore. At the time of unloading the unloading clerk after examining the seals and locks and finding them intact cuts

the seals and opens the locks and then examines the condition and marks of each package as it is unloaded from the wagons, checking the same with the entries in the wagon guidance. In cases where the seals are deficient or defective the Railway Police are called in to witness the unloading and to check the contents of such wagons. At the time of transshipment the transshipment clerk or the person deputized to supervise the transshipment observes the procedure detailed above in the unloading and reloading of the wagons.

(b) The loading, unloading or transshipment clerk as the case may be supervises the staff employed in handling the goods.

(c) Wagons are fastened by means of cotters and top-fasteners and are sealed with tin shackle seals or tap and sealing wax and in some cases locked in addition to sealing immediately after loading. Sealing of wagons is always done through the cotter pin plug and the cotter pin slot of the outer half door of the wagon, as it is then not possible to effect an entrance into the wagon without affecting the seals.

(d) Seals of wagons are checked before being drawn out of goods sheds or taken away from the stations by the gunners or guards of the trains who are required to sign for wagons with seals and locks intact in the station records. Guards taking charge of trains examine the seals as well as the wagons on their trains and give signature for the correctness thereof to the station staff. In the case of wagons attached to or detached from their trains at intermediate stations seals are examined and receipts given by the guard or taken by him for wagons attached or detached. When making goods trains at the end of their runs seals on wagons are checked jointly by the guard and station staff and a record of this is maintained at the stations in a register maintained for the purpose. At several appointed stations on the railway and also while a train stands at a station or in siding for any length of time guards are required to check the seals and wagons and to keep a record thereof in their train Memo. books. There is also a joint traffic and police check of seals at inter-provincial stations.

(e) Loaded wagons in the yards are guarded by the watch and ward staff occasionally aided by the police, especially when yard thefts at any station become heavy. There is no special guard on running trains, but where thefts from running trains through any particular district or any particular locality are heavy a posse of special police escort such trains through the area.

Mr. Hindley, Agent, stated that the extent to which the State and the public suffered through the prevalence of thefts and damage to goods in transit and thefts of railway property might be measured approximately by the amount which was paid out yearly in claims for goods damaged, stolen and lost. The following figures were of importance in regard to this point:—

1910	Rs. 3,64,649
1915	,, 5,24,629
1920	,, 12,57,351

The size of the expenditure under this head was an indication that much remained to be done to reduce losses by theft of goods while on the railway and while it was not denied that there was room for improvement in the actual handling and conveying arrangements there appeared to be *prima facie* reasons for improvements in police arrangements both on the watch and ward side and in the crime and order section.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that the systems were satisfactory.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, stated with reference to (a), that it was possible for one man to supervise the loading of two wagons, but beyond that he could not go. The check was unreliable. With reference to (b) at some stations Company labour was employed and at other stations labour was employed by station masters or goods contractors. He did not agree with the system in its entirety. The labour contractor was only responsible for the labour and if there was a shortage from a seals-intact wagon responsibility could not be fixed upon him. Thus there was divided responsibility. He suggested that the labour contractor should be paid a higher rate for the work he did and should be held solely responsible for the staff he employed. There was however no system that could entirely prevent loss or theft. At present pilferage went generally unnoticed but he would not go so far as to say that coolies earned their living by what they robbed. What they did was to pick up sweepings and take them away. It was not possible for the goods contractors or station masters to employ men without paying them unless they organized a gang of thieves. Security was not taken from the men employed for handling goods. Referring to (c), he was not in favour of top-fasteners because they did not act, but favoured the locking of wagons. Such patent locks as were in use on the East Indian Railway were working well. Tin shackles were used for sealing at almost all stations.

Mr. Roberison, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, referring to (e) stated that the system in force could not be said to be satisfactory in regard to the care of loaded wagons on trains or wagons in yards, because a large amount of theft took place. It was doubtful at the present time whether there was any cure short of armed force. Guards of trains were not allowed to carry arms. It was impossible to guard the whole train when attacked by gangs who were more or less armed. In regard to robberies in yards he considered that the police could do a great deal if they took more trouble in tracing the receivers of stolen goods and prosecuting them. The prosecution of a few coolies was a very doubtful deterrent, as men of this class did not mind going to jail and there were always others to take their place. At nearly every large station on the East Indian Railway a regular business was made of receiving and disposing of stolen goods.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, Mokameh Ghat, referring to (e) did not consider that the system in force was satisfactory. The yard was a regular thoroughfare. Running trains should have police guards. Referring to (b) he said that he recruited his own labour at Mokameh Ghat and obtained them from the adjoining villages. The rates were fixed by the Company for the whole year and from time to time were revised.

Babu Kalka Pershad, Station Master, Jumna Bridge, stated that the systems were satisfactory but referring to (e) said that at roadside stations more chowkidars were required.

whereas the ordinary seal could be tampered with and re-sealed. One method was to put the end of the twine up against a piece of sealing wax, strike a match and gum it and by using a raw potato an exact representation of the seal could be reproduced. The railway was trying to introduce a system of joint seal checking at engine-changing stations. The Superintendent of Railway Police, Saidpur, was in favour of the system but the Superintendent of Sealdah was opposed to it. Referring to (e) he said that the system was satisfactory but a long train was too much for one Guard.

Mr. Mealins, District Traffic Superintendent, referring to (b), stated that except at large transshipment points the labour was supplied by station masters and that they or the clerks under them supervised the handling. He was corroborated by Messrs. Minahan, Transportation Inspector and Dench, Station Master. Referring to (e) he thought that there was room for improvement. Mr. Minahan agreed.

Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, Serajganj, thought that arrangements under (e) were satisfactory except on running trains and suggested the use of search lights.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, described the systems as follows:—

(a) and (b) The loading and unloading is done by special clerks at large stations and where there is heavy transshipment. The work is supervised by the station master and at smaller depôts the station masters and goods clerks are solely or jointly responsible in accordance with the importance of the station.

(c) This is done similar to (a) and (b) in accordance with the importance and staff detailed at the different depôts. Sealing is usually of the string, label and lac description with seal impressions for each depôt. Other systems are frequently used when procurable such as wire or tin shackles, etc. The seals are fixed in the door rings.

(d) This is done by trains clerks, goods clerks, station masters, guards, police and watch and ward whenever necessary, individually or jointly.

(e) Loaded wagons in small yards are usually locked and kept as near to the station as possible. In large yards they are watched by the watch and ward staff. On running trains guards check seals at engine-changing stations and where time permits. At points where train thefts are suspected watchmen and station menials are deputed to the off-side of trains to keep an eye on wagons, and on certain sections patrol constables travel on night trains.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, referring to (a) and (b), mentioned that at Chandpur all inward goods were taken into the sheds and checked there. In the case of piece-goods if the bales were found tampered with, they were opened and an account of the goods was taken from the Steamer Company which naturally objected as this procedure laid them open to claims. Referring to (c) he stated that lead seals were used till recently when the Company reverted to the ordinary sealing-wax on account of expense. Experiments were being made with an American seal. If an attempt were made to open this seal, it fell to pieces.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that the systems were fairly satisfactory if carried out. Referring to (e) he said that on special occasions the police were called upon to guard wagons in transit at points where regular raids on running trains had been made as for instance between Strand Road and Chittagong in spite of which during the rice boom of 1914, 1915 and 1916 wagons *en route* were opened and rice removed.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager, described the systems as follows:—

(a) Goods are checked by goods clerks when receiving, transshipping and unloading. The men examine packages and if any tampering or deficiency is found they bring it to the notice of the authority and follow the procedure laid down for dealing with such cases.

(b) At small stations the station master supervises the goods clerks; at large stations the head goods clerks or loading and unloading inspectors exercise the immediate supervision while the general responsibility and inspection of the goods sheds, etc., remain with the head station master.

(c) Wagons are fastened by the fastening porter or goods coolie under the supervision of the loading clerk; the sealing is done by menials under the supervision of a clerk who sees that seals are correctly impressed and keeps the seal in his own possession after the operation is finished.

(d) Seals are checked by guards when taking over wagons, also by goods clerks when making over and receiving wagons. Occasional checks are made by the police at certain points to see that wagons have passed with seals intact.

(e) Loaded wagons are watched by jemadars in the yard and by the guards on running trains. When necessary the police take special precaution to put on police guards both at stations and on running trains.

Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager, considered the present system as satisfactory as could be expected under the present conditions. With better organization and more vigilant checking better results would no doubt be obtained. Referring to (c) he stated that it was the practice to rivet wagons and the system appeared to be working satisfactorily. He was unable to express a definite opinion on the question of the necessity for one universal lock on all railways. In 1919 the East Indian Railway Ellis Lock was examined and it was decided to adopt it for universal use; the moment it was decided the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway stated that that lock was useless and they preferred their own. Other railways followed suit while the North-Western Railway continued with their own system of riveting wagons. The matter stood in the same position now. The Bengal-Nagpur Railway had also adopted a riveting system, which he considered a better system than that in use on the North-Western Railway because the head was riveted and made into a seal on which the impression of the station could be put so that it was practically a rivet and seal combined. There had been three or four cases of tampering with rivets. There was the possibility, if the riveting system were

made universal, that means would be devised of breaking it open. There were expert thieves, who could break rivets when the train was running.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Kanacki Port, considered that the systems were sound but the difficulty was in getting the staff to do their work conscientiously. Referring to (b) he said that the contractor had little control over his coolies. "I have never made him pay for damages. I have had to accept them myself." Referring to (c) he had not found that chowkidars and jemadars were entrusted with station seals. They were often made over to them at the beginning of the day but were locked up at night.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Calcutta, Lahore, considered that the systems in force were unsatisfactory mainly because they were inefficiently carried out.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, referring to (a), stated that the tallying of goods was neglected and the form of Inwards Tally Book on State Railways did not provide for this part of the work so that shortages from seals intact wagons were not in all cases a matter of short loading but unquestionably due in a great measure to deliberate thefts. In the absence of marks on bags there was nothing to prevent bags being mixed up with lots previously unloaded in the same platform or in a shed. Under the contract system there was no tally and no tallying could be carried out. Where there was quick work there could not be careful work done. Referring to (b), he stated that the system for the handling of goods on this railway was faulty as at all grain-loading stations the labor employed was supplied by merchants with the result that the work to a very great extent was left in the hands of owners, the railway staff being insufficient. At stations in the Port Area and at Hyderabad the contract system for the handling of goods was ruinous to the railway for obvious reasons. Contractors paid their coolies for piecework and the consequence of this system and the work not being done by the railway was that pilferage and damage to goods was scandalous.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, stated that the systems were satisfactory when properly enforced, but if for any reason slackness was allowed to creep in thefts necessarily resulted. Referring to (c) he stated that special measures were in force in Sibi where there was a force of 25 chowkidars and 12 armed police. The chowkidars reported themselves to the Police before they came on duty. Since that system had been introduced only three cases of theft from the yard had occurred in 1920. When thefts were frequent in any particular locality on account of tribes moving about the vicinity and if foot-prints were traced to the villages the Shahi-Jirga had to make good the value of the goods lost.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, referring to (b), stated that the present method of handling goods was the only matter which in his opinion was unsatisfactory and deserving of serious attention at the hands of the railway authorities. Damage to goods and pilferage was mostly due to the fact that "handling" was done by a contractor who generally was not responsible for such defective operations and did not therefore consider himself concerned in any way whatsoever as regards the interests of the railway which was held responsible for the proper and safe handling of goods. The contractor confined himself only to quick handling of the goods and did not mind how the goods were actually handled by the coolies. As regards pilferages it could be safely stated that fifty per cent. could be traced to have been done by the handling coolies. The practice of giving the contract to the handling contractor was detrimental to the interests of the Traffic Department; for instance, a station master who had to tranship the contents of two wagons from broad-gauge to metre-gauge would utilize only ten wagons whereas the contractor would want twenty wagons. If the station master were in charge of the contract he would unload the stuff on to the ground and then gradually remove it to the other gauge, but the contractor would not worry himself so long as he got his maundage rate. Even as regards the proper handling of the consignments the contractor generally sublet the contract to the coolies or jemadar with the result that many wagons were badly handled, the contractor simply pocketing his money. He suggested that station masters should be given the contract. He cited an instance in which he received a consignment from Sata Road short by two bags of *atta*. He sent a telegram to the forwarding station and the station master replied that the bags were correctly sent. Two days later he received a letter in which it was stated that the bags were not despatched and they would follow shortly. The owner had informed the station master of the fact. This instance was the outcome of the handling having been done by the owner. The station master or clerk concerned could not possibly go into these things for the simple reason that at roadside stations there was only one person to look after all work. The goods clerk had only one man to do the handling and he naturally took the assistance of the merchant; consequently shortages occurred. Referring to (d) he stated that actual seal checking was not generally done by a responsible official. The mere handing over of a seal to a sealsman or a porter for the purpose of sealing wagons and his returning it to the clerk or station master concerned was usually taken as the correct sealing of wagons. Referring to (e) he stated that the guarding of wagons on running trains while standing in the station yard was done by the chowkidar on duty but at a station where there was no chowkidar this duty was done by a menial on the off-side of the train. This was not always done as owing to the staff being engaged in their own legitimate work on occasion of passenger trains crossing goods trains, the waiting goods train remained unguarded. The guard in charge of the goods train was seldom on the alert. In some cases a police constable travelled with a goods train but his guarding of the train was more or less nominal. A chowkidar should run with every train.

Bengal and North Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, described the systems as follows :—

(a) The goods are tallied out of and into the wagons at the time of loading, unloading, and transshipment by special clerks.

(b) The handling staff are under the control of the tally clerk and the watch and ward staff are a further check on any attempts at pilferage.

(c) Wagons are sealed as soon as loaded.

(d) and (e) Loaded wagons in yards are under the watch of chowkidars and the rest of the station staff where the chowkidari staff would be insufficient are deputed to take turns of duty in watching the wagons. In addition to this the station master in charge by night or by day is supposed to make a periodical round to see that the men are on the alert. In regard to the protection of wagons on running trains the guard of a goods train takes up the "Line Clear" token at any stopping stations examining the seals on the way up on one side of the train and returns from the engine down the other side of the train, similarly examining the seals of the wagons on that side. At stations where goods trains stop at night some of the staff are posted to watch each side of the train to see that no attempts at thefts are made and where a district is known to be bad special chowkidars are appointed for this purpose and the Railway Police are called in to take special measures for protection.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, considered that the systems in force were satisfactory although a great deal had to be taken on trust. Referring to (b), he stated that the Company employed its own palladars and paid them on an average Rs. 8-8 per mensem. At Mokameh Ghat the handling contract had been given to the Traffic Inspector. Referring to (c), he said the difficulty was to get a lock that would not prove a nuisance.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, was of opinion that the systems were as satisfactory as any that could be devised. It was not possible entirely to prevent well-organized attempts at robbery by a gang of determined thieves.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, thought that the systems in force were satisfactory. Referring to (b), he stated that the system of having whole-time coolies was better than the contract system as better control could be maintained. Whenever there was a rush of traffic extra men were employed. In his part of the country the living wage was Rs. 5 for a man with a family. He paid his own servants Rs. 10. It was not a fact that there were certain stations where coolies were allowed to work in the yard without any payment being made to them. Referring to (c), he thought that a system of locking would improve matters to a considerable extent. The present system was not satisfactory. It was easy for a thief to break open the wagons with the result that the Railway Company was saddled with heavy claims. Lead seals could be opened without much difficulty. The introduction of lead seals would not improve matters. The one would be as unsatisfactory as the other. Some form of locking apparatus was essential.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, considered that the systems were satisfactory. Referring to (b) he stated that at junction stations palladars received Rs. 10-8 a month as wages and at roadside stations where they had less work they got Rs. 8-8. Although Rs. 15 was the living wage for chowkidars a better class of men was obtained for that employment. Palladars came from a lower class. At the time of the Sonapur fair goods lay exposed on the platform.

Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra, was of opinion that the system in force was satisfactory. Referring to (b), he stated that nothing less than Rs. 12 for a man with his wife and one child was a living wage. Outward goods were often left in an exposed condition.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, described the systems as follows :—

(a) At small stations goods are tallied into and from wagons by the station masters in charge and at transshipment stations by the transshipment clerk and his assistants. Loading and unloading tally books are maintained as a record of the number of articles dealt with in connection with each wagon.

(b) The handling staff is supervised by the goods clerk or the loading clerk as the case may be.

(c) After the contents of a wagon have been checked by the loading or tally clerk on completion of the operation the doors are closed and taped, the tape being sealed to the wagon label with a seal bearing the code initials of the station concerned.

(d) The wagon seals are checked by the number taker on the arrival of a train and again by the tally clerk when placed in position for unloading.

(e) Loaded wagons in yards are guarded by the railway watch and ward establishment. The following instructions are in force for the protection of wagons on trains standing at stations. Railway servants are deputed to watch either side of the trains and the brakeman taking line clear ticket to the driver has orders to return to his brake-van on the opposite side of his train from that on which he proceeded to the engine.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that while these arrangements were not entirely satisfactory it was considered that they were the best that could be arranged with the forces available. With reference to (a), the supervision of the loading and unloading of wagons was apt to be cursory. With reference to (b), the labour for handling goods was Company labour except at Mokameh Ghat where the Transshipment Inspector had the contract. Handling was done on a very large scale there and the Transshipment Inspector had to obtain special labour for the business. The system, however, was unsound because the coolies were doubtful about their emoluments. He thought payments were rather precarious and coolies were apt to make it up by other means. Referring to (c) he thought that

locks resulted in a vast amount of trouble with regard to keys. He had no experience of riveting. With reference to (d), seal checking was done in a cursory manner, but many seals were noted as having arrived at a place intact when in reality they were not so. It required considerable experience before a man could detect it. Number-takers did not think of the possibility of seals being removed and re-sealed. At engine-changing stations only the police checked seals. Their check was not very much better than the check of the men employed by the railway. He did not mean to say that it was an intentional deficiency but he did not think that the men were capable of checking some of the manipulated seals. It was a matter which required a considerable amount of actual experience in the form of manipulation. A small squad of men specially trained in regard to seals might prove very useful but they should not be confined to one spot but should be moved about the line. With reference to (e), police patrols were occasionally employed at important stations where thefts had been of frequent occurrence and an extension of this practice where possible would undoubtedly have beneficial results.

Mr. Johns, Traffic Inspector, suggested that goods or mixed trains conveying a considerable number of wagons should have electrically fitted brake-vans at either end with powerful side-lights, the lamp brackets to be fitted in alignment with the flap door seal labels of wagons and another ordinary brake-van situated in the middle of the train should convey two constables, one to look out on either side of the train and from which they could easily discern any one approaching a wagon to commit a theft.

Mr. Gardner, Station Master, Bareilly City, referring to (e), stated that several thefts had been perpetrated on loaded wagons on running trains which would in all probability have not occurred had the two railway constables been vigilant and had they alighted one on either side of the train immediately it came to a stand and patrolled it, as it was impossible for the guard to do so, since he had to take in and give out packages and line clear. It was common knowledge that the constables were practically immune from punishment which placed a premium on irresponsible working, as in all such cases the guard only was punished and a part of the claims paid was debited to him. The system which obtained at present was far from satisfactory considering the length of trains and the entire absence of lighting arrangements to enable the guard to see if wagons were being attacked by thieves.

Pundit Amrit Lal Tewari, Station Master, Budawn, considered the systems in force satisfactory.

Question No. 6.—Are the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transhipment sheds satisfactory?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Mr. Horrey, Agent, stated that for the prevention of thefts in goods sheds it was proposed on his railway to increase the number of police and in checking the cost of the scheme he came to the conclusion that it would be very much better to spend the money in lighting and fencing the yards than to have a recurring expenditure on extra police. His views were that if yards were efficiently lighted which was now being done in the larger ones, it would go a long way towards putting a stop to thefts in yards. His assertion would be borne out by Mr. Warren's diagram showing the percentage of thefts which occurred during the bright moonlight period of the month. This diagram proved that the better the lighting arrangements the less the number of thefts. Improvements in lighting and fencing arrangements would involve less expenditure than a recurring charge on the police.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, stated that complete fencing in the present state of railway finance would be prohibitively expensive. It was contemplated shortly to instal fifty more big lamps at important stations on the line; but fencing and high power lamps alone would not enable the railway to prevent thefts unless they had an efficient watch and ward staff as well. He had seen the figures in Mr. Warren's diagram and was aware of the fact that lighting at night minimized thefts even with an insufficient staff. It did not, however, entirely prevent thefts and for that purpose an efficient watch and ward was a necessary factor even where lights and fences were fully provided. Recently at Bareilly a wagon was robbed directly under a high-power lamp.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that lighting was not sufficient but was being improved. He was not in favour of fencing. There was no fencing on the railway except at Cawnpore. The cost of fencing would be very heavy and the interest on the capital would, in his opinion, be more than the amount of claims paid. Fencing would not prevent thefts.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, stated that lighting was inadequate, but schemes were in hand for improving lighting of yards. Fencing was poor, but schemes were also under consideration for walling all large goods yards. They were at present held up for want of funds.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Bara Banki, thought that all large yards should be provided with better lighting and should be adequately fenced. At present there was hardly any fencing.

Mr. O'Connor, Station Superintendent, Lucknow, stated that great improvement in lighting was required. He would wall in sheds. Fencing was no good.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, stated that most of the goods sheds on the system had now been enclosed. A good deal of money had been spent during the last few years in this direction and he thought that about fifty per cent. of the sheds had been satisfactorily enclosed. All the new sheds that had recently been built were practically thief-proof. Yards were enclosed by wire-fencing. He could not say that they were thief-proof. Most of the thieving took place in the large yards. At small stations there was not much thieving. The railway had instituted a very elaborate system of lighting by high power lamps in their yards at engine-changing stations. The police had made some suggestions with regard to better lighting which had been carried out.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated that the majority of goods sheds were enclosed sheds. There was room for improvement in some cases in respect of the provision of larger enclosed goods sheds. Pilfering and thefts took place from goods stacked outside the sheds which was necessitated in a large measure by traffic offering in excess of the ability of the railway promptly to clear and which under present arrangements as a facility to merchants was allowed to be stacked within railway premises. In the majority of cases any possible fencing of the yard would effect very little, if any, improvement.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, stated that the fencing-in of goods sheds and their lighting were generally satisfactory.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, stated that both were unsatisfactory. Stations and yards should be properly walled-in or enclosed by unclimbable barbed wire fencing. Yards should be well lighted. Considerable improvement, however, had been made in this respect in recent years.

Mr. Flynn, Goods Superintendent, Wadi Bunder, stated that the lighting was very good, but the fencing was quite insufficient to keep the public out. He had found it impossible to prevent outsiders from coming into the yards.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, stated that neither was satisfactory. Only a few stations were safely protected, *i.e.*, where goods sheds were enclosed entirely. The lighting was bad. All goods sheds should be enclosed by strong iron bars with gates. Also increased accommodation should be provided in parcels strong rooms. Goods sheds and yards should be lighted with a sufficient number of high power lamps.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, stated that the lighting and fencing required attention.

Rao Sahib G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, stated that the lighting was satisfactory but the fencing was not satisfactory.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, referring to his yard stated that it was partly walled and partly fenced. He did not consider that fencing was any precaution against pilferage and thefts of small and light articles. The yard was satisfactorily lighted by electric light.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, thought that the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transhipment sheds was satisfactory.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that it was not usual for work to be carried on in goods and tranship sheds at night. Goods in goods sheds were protected by the shed being locked up. Tranship sheds were open, but goods were not as a rule left on the platform when work had stopped. The question of fencing-in and lighting of goods sheds and transhipment sheds—apart from the question of fencing-in and lighting of station yard—might be considered as satisfactory on the whole. There was congestion in goods yards at certain times of the year, and work had to be done at night for the sake of wagon supply. It was done in order to relieve the wagons. The lighting arrangements were sufficient. He believed that every goods shed could be locked up. He did not think that the fencing of goods sheds and transhipment sheds was really a very important matter, as the railway yard was a public place and it was very difficult to keep people out of it.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that the lighting and fencing-in of all goods sheds and transhipment sheds was generally satisfactory. Where night work was done in a goods yard, high power lamps were supplied.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, considered the lighting fairly satisfactory in the large yards. The fencing was as satisfactory as possible. Complete isolation was impossible.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, did not consider that the lighting and fencing-in was satisfactory. The number of lamps in the shunting yards and at larger stations should

be increased by at least thirty per cent. The fencing was invariably inadequate to keep out outsiders, being in most cases ordinary wire-fencing. He suggested that where masonry walls could not be erected, barbed wire-fencing to a height of about six feet with a foot between each length should be put up.

Mr. Dutt Roy, Station Master, Tumkur, considered that both were satisfactory.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Logan, Agent, was not in favour of fencing unless it was unclimbable.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that the fencing-in of goods sheds and transhipment sheds was inadequate, but he was not a believer in fencing unless the fence was unclimbable. Regarding lighting, high power lights had been supplied for use in the larger yards and the number was being gradually increased. He had no reason to suspect that where lighting by oil lamps was employed that the lamps were not kept lit all night with the object of saving oil or pocketing the cost of lighting, because inspecting officers paid attention to this matter.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that there was difficulty in fencing a transhipment shed. There were vehicles moving in and out and gates across the railway lines could not be locked. There was too much shunting to permit that being done. Transhipment sheds were generally situated in the middle of the traffic yard. There was no difficulty in locking big goods sheds.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, stated that recently considerable improvement had been made in the matter of lighting, but there was still room for further improvement.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madurai, did not consider that the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transhipment sheds was satisfactory.

Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, thought that both were satisfactory, but there was room for improvement by the provision of additional high power lights.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transhipment yards was satisfactory as far as was known. More, however, could be done in the direction of lighting such sheds with high power lamps or electric lights which would gradually be done.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, stated that neither was very satisfactory which was due to want of funds owing to restrictions imposed during the war.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, stated that the lighting and fencing-in was not satisfactory, but this was a question of finance which was at present being dealt with by the Railway Commission.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, stated that the lighting and fencing were not as satisfactory as they might be.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, Mokameh Ghat, stated that in most cases the lighting was not satisfactory and the fencing-in of big goods sheds with ordinary wire fencing was far from satisfactory. Sheds should be enclosed. The initial outlay would be great but thefts would be greatly minimized if not altogether stopped. The yard at Mokameh Ghat was a thoroughfare. There were not enough high power lamps and there was just the ordinary three wire fencing. Only one shed was locked.

Babu Kalka Pershad, Station Master, Jumna Bridge, stated that neither was satisfactory. Many stations had no light or fencing and the sheds were unprotected.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, stated that the majority of goods sheds were enclosed but none were fenced-in. At some stations where they were not enclosed this was gradually being done. Lighting was as satisfactory as could be expected in the circumstances. The staff did not make the best use of the lamps and oil provided. Presumably they did not burn lamps at night for the purpose of saving the oil for their own benefit.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Coates, Agent, stated that the lighting of large goods yards and transhipment point was satisfactory. The lighting of other stations was being improved as funds permitted. The fencing was not efficient.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that some of the large goods yards and transhipment yards were satisfactorily lighted and arrangements had been made to light the remainder as funds became available. It was not usual for work to be done at railway goods sheds at night. All goods sheds were capable of being locked. It was difficult and costly efficiently to fence in goods yards and transhipment sheds. Accordingly no special measures had been

taken in this direction. There were open outward sheds for jute, etc., but all inward sheds, where the railway was responsible for the goods it received, were provided with doors and locks.

Mr. Jenkins, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that thefts took place more frequently from loaded wagons in yards than from goods sheds and the better lighting of station yards generally was therefore desirable. The fencing at present provided afforded no protection. High palisade fencing was required. If this were provided a reduction could possibly be made in the Watch and Ward staff. The fencing would also allow of one or two exits only being used by workers and suspicious persons could be searched.

Mr. Minalan, Transportation Inspector, Shannagar and Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, Serajganj, thought that both were unsatisfactory.

Mr. Dench, Station Master, Santahar, thought that both were satisfactory.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that with the exception of the terminal yard at the jetties none of the large stations was satisfactorily enclosed. At the jetties unclimbable fencing had been provided. The lighting of the large stations with the exception of Chittagong was good. It had been found that with the improvement of lighting there had been a diminution in thefts. For instance at Laksam in 1911, the railway paid Rs. 3,510 as compensation for thefts in the yard but in 1913, the year following the improvement in lighting at this station, and in 1920, the railway paid no compensation.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, and Mr. Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, agreed with Mr. Cooper's remarks.

Mr. Jones, Supervising Station Master, Chandpur, said that he had worked at three large stations and his experience had been that although the stations were unfenced the lighting was good.

Babu M. Ghosh, Station Master, Garhathi, stated that the fencing and lighting, more especially at small stations, were not satisfactory.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boulth, Traffic Manager, stated that fencing and protection for sheds were provided according to demand and there were continual applications for increased protection owing to development of traffic which were complied with as far as means permitted. Lighting of goods sheds was not always satisfactory but high power lamps were supplied at certain sheds.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi, did not consider that goods sheds and yards were satisfactorily fenced-in and lighted. A certain amount could be done to improve matters without going to great expense. With a really high unclimbable iron fencing round the goods sheds it might be possible to reduce the number of chowkidars and also thefts, which, however, were not numerous. At many upcountry stations there was no fencing at all. The expense in making all stations theft-proof would be enormous. Much money might be spent in fencing goods sheds and lighting up yards and platforms, but he did not think that the majority of thefts were due to the defects in these two matters, as would be shown by his reply to Question No. 7.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that the present lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transhipment sheds was inadequate.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, agreed.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, was of opinion that matters were not altogether satisfactory.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, stated that neither was satisfactory. Goods and transhipment yards were fenced-in and were fairly satisfactory. His experience had been that much of the pilfering and stealing from wagons or vans or tampering with packages at stations was due to poor lighting of the yards and stations. Losses from wagons in yards were probably responsible for the heavy claims paid by the railway and this could, in his opinion, be considerably reduced if the yards were better lit up to enable the watch and ward to keep a better lookout. Wagons placed in sidings in times of stress of traffic were frequently attacked by outside gangs and it was here that the District Police could be of assistance by having the surroundings within their area carefully watched when wagons had been of necessity so placed. The Railway on its own part could, in his opinion, help to bring a good deal to light if more rigorous measures in the way of checks and enquiries were adopted in cases where losses were reported.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, stated that the lighting was fairly satisfactory but the fencing-in of goods sheds was very unsatisfactory. At most of the large stations the way of access to goods sheds at night was the same as it was during the day.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Colonel Inst, Agent, stated that the question of improving the lighting of the more important junctions was under consideration.

Mr. Webster J, Traffic Manager, stated that fencing was not intended to prevent thefts but to prevent trespassers and to prevent carts from making roads across railway premises. While fencing was badly required the Company was quite prepared to extend it, but there did not appear to be much in the complaint that there were not enough lock-up places provided for goods and parcels. The question of fencing was a very difficult matter. The railway would like to have transshipment yards fenced in. Palisade fencing six or seven feet high instead of the present height would go a long way towards preventing theft.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Dooars, thought that the lighting was as satisfactory as could be arranged under the present conditions. The lighting of goods sheds and yards with high power lamps would tend to minimize thefts. All goods sheds were provided with a room in which the more valuable goods such as piecegoods, brass, bell-metal ware, etc., could be locked up. Bulky goods such as bags were kept in an open shed under the protection of a chowkidar or chowkidars.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, thought that the lighting was satisfactory, but more of the goods sheds and transshipment sheds should be enclosed or walled so that the goods could be locked in.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Dooars, was of opinion that the lighting was satisfactory but suggested that a part of the transshipment sidings and goods sheds should be walled and capable of being locked up for the better security of goods.

Babu Jank Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra, stated that the railway compound was properly fenced but wherever new goods sheds had been constructed they were in an open condition with only a small room (walled) where valuable goods were kept locked up. More lights were required outside and goods sheds should be enlarged and enclosed by walls.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, considered that the lighting and fencing-in of goods sheds and transshipment sheds was satisfactory.

Pundit Amrit Lall Tewari, Station Master, Badaun, agreed with Mr. Strachan.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Claims Inspector, did not agree.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, thought that matters could be improved.

Question No. 7.—Are pilferages or thefts from :—

- (a) goods sheds of goods booked or unbooked ;
- (b) transshipment yards ;
- (c) goods trains, and
- (d) passenger trains (luggage booked or unbooked)

frequent on your railway, and do the Railway Police take any cognizance of such cases, or measures to prevent such losses ? If not, do you consider that they should do so ?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Name.	Frequent.	Infrequent.
Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager	(a), (b), (c), (d)	...
Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent	(b), (c)	...
Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent	(a), (c)	(b), (d)
„ Walsh, Traffic Inspector	(a)	...
„ Naidu, Station Master	(a)	...

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, stated that thefts of luggage were not so common but there was a considerable amount of pilferage from parcels which came in the same category of coaching traffic. The Railway Police did not generally take cognizance unless pressed to do so. "One becomes somewhat hopeless with these cases. There is so much pilferage and it is really useless to prove a pilferage case, because everybody is engaged in it and no trace would ever be found." If cognizance were taken by the Police in all cases, friction between the Traffic Department and the Police would ensue, but if a sound Police could be guaranteed he was of opinion that all cases should be enquired into.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that running train thefts accounted for 50% of the cases and yard thefts for the remainder. Referring to

(c) he stated that thefts from wagons standing in the yard and goods sheds occurred through the connivance of the station staff, the Railway Police and also the District Police. The thieves could not manage matters without the help of these men. Referring to (c), he stated that thieves boarded the train when she was leaving a station and threw goods out of the wagon at or near a place selected by them for that purpose, and when the train was slowed down at the next station they jumped off. Recently a case occurred between Moghal-Sarai and Dufferin Bridge (Kashi) when five bales of piece-goods were stolen. The evidence showed that when the train was about to start the thieves got on to the wagon, worked their way in, threw the bales out and then jumped off the train.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, referring to (a) stated that thefts were more frequent from unbooked goods. He believed that constables and watchmen were generally concerned. The matter was one about which little evidence was obtained, but the general feeling was that the two worked together. The Railway Police took cognizance of cases when reported, but as a general rule complaints were not received from merchants, who might miss a small quantity of grain but did not consider it worth while making a report. In fact they had not the time to make such reports and then to attend court afterwards.

Mr. Walsh, Traffic Inspector, was of opinion that thefts mostly took place at goods and transshipment sheds. It was his duty to investigate these cases to fix the responsibility and he had formed a pretty clear idea as to who was responsible for the majority of these pilferages and thefts, namely, the railway staff themselves.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Bara Banki, referring to (a) stated that pilferages of booked and unbooked goods occurred in the goods sheds when there was a heavy rush of work. Once goods were booked they were immediately loaded. Where the contents of a bale were removed and stones substituted it was generally done when the goods were awaiting despatch. At his station 1,800 wagons were booked every day and the staff was unable to keep a proper watch.

Mr. O'Connor, Station Superintendent, Lucknow, stated that pilferages were mostly committed on the loading platform by the handling coolies. There were more thefts in yards but more valuable articles were stolen from running trains.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Name of officer.						Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Rumboll	(c)	...
„ Alexander	(c), (d);	...
„ Burn	(a), (b), (c)	(d)
„ Cooke	(b), (c)	(a), (d)
„ Gwynne	(b), (c), (d)	...
„ Adams	(c)	...
„ Gokhale	(a), (b), (c), (d)	...

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, stated that (c) running train thefts, accounted for approximately 50% of the total value of the losses sustained by the railway. It was a part of the duty of the Police to prevent running train thefts. In bad outbreaks, the Police should institute patrols. In exceptional conditions, such as now existing between Igatpuri and Nandgaon, it was beyond the scope of any railway to prevent thefts. All that they could do was to exercise reasonable precautions such as locking of wagons, seal checking and running of goods trains during the day where it was possible, instead of by night. With reference to the complaint made by the trading community in Bombay who had stated that with regard to goods lost in running train thefts, when claims were lodged they were told that the theft or loss was due to causes beyond the control of the Company, he stated that the situation was as follows: The railway carried goods at special rates under a contract which provided that they should not be held responsible for thefts from running trains. The railway was quite willing to pay the claim if the consignment had been sent at railway risk. On certain conditions the railway gave merchants a reduced rate and they agreed to send the goods at that rate at their own risk. The charge was lower and the merchants got the benefit. To provide against risk, there was another way open to them which was to have their goods insured through an Insurance Company. Running train thefts were more or less confined to certain areas which were well defined. There was no difficulty in establishing that a case was due to running train theft. The onus of proving that fact lay on the railway. When a wagon which had left the last engine-changing station with seals-intact was discovered with seals broken or doors open, that was evidence of a running train theft. In cases where additional police were engaged to prevent running train thefts, the railway were under a contract with the Government of India which laid down that all additional police should be paid for by the Government of India. It was a matter which purely lay between the Government of India (Railway Department) and the Government of India (Finance Department). Referring to (d), theft of Railway material, he thought that pilferage had increased recently. Theft of small parts of rolling stock had been very frequent since 1914; in fact, to such an extent that the safety of running trains had been affected. It had been worst in Bengal. Throughout India owing to high prices of spare parts, etc., pilferages had been very considerable. About a year ago, about 50% of axle box covers were missing from wagons. They could not be replaced, so

wooden or card-board covers were substituted. Referring to the question of cognizance, he stated that the present arrangement was that the Railway Police took no cognizance unless the railway established a case of theft and reported it to them. Formerly they used to take cognizance of everything. He thought that the present attitude of the Police was quite reasonable, but from the railway point of view, it was preferable that the Police should make their investigations for them.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, referring to (c), stated that thefts from running goods trains and wagons standing in the yards were very heavy. (a) Cases of thefts from passenger trains were fairly numerous. Any person detected pilfering or thieving was made over to the Police.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, stated that thefts from (a) and (b) were not of serious importance. Theft from (c) were very serious between Igatpuri and Bhusawal. The Railway Police took no cognizance of thefts or pilferages under heads (a), (b) and (d), unless they were specially reported to them. They, however, took measures to prevent thefts from goods trains.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, referring to (c), suggested that the co-operation of Government district officials such as Collectors, District Superintendents of Police, etc., should be sought with a view to obtaining the assistance of Mamlatdars, Police Patels and Patels of villages, through whom villages within a distance of ten or fifteen miles of the railway should maintain a register of inhabitants of the lower orders during the night, in order to prevent them from leaving their villages and committing thefts on running trains, to cope with which the Railway Police at present appeared to be helpless, due, in his opinion, to want of co-operation between the Railway and District Police. Referring to (d) he stated that cases often occurred in connection with luggage on some districts. Passengers were frequently robbed of their personal luggage, valuables and money from the compartments they were travelling in. These thefts were effected when they got out of their carriages to go to the dining car or elsewhere. Another method was to enter the carriages while the passengers were asleep.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, referring to (c), stated that the goods trains were frequently attacked by thieves and mentioned an instance which came under his actual experience. He was informed that trains were being attacked at Jhansi distant signal. He requested the Divisional Police Inspector to accompany him with half a dozen constables to the next station, Bijoli, with the object of returning by a train arriving at Jhansi after midnight. He instructed the Jhansi Assistant Station Master to keep signals against the train for five minutes. Prior to entraining at Bijoli he impressed upon the Inspector and constables the necessity of keeping quiet while the train was being attacked and to wait until the thieves came opposite the wagon in which they were concealed, and that he would give the order to attack. The train duly started and as it approached the signal and was slowing down the thieves attacked the train while it was in motion and removed eleven tins of ghee, after which when they were approaching the centre of the train, a couple of wagons from where the party was concealed, a constable shouted out "Thief!" and the Inspector fired his revolver in the air which resulted in the thieves escaping. The circumstances were reported to the Superintendent of Police, and resulted in the Inspector being transferred.

Rao Sahab G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, referring to (d), stated that the Police should maintain order on station platforms and prevent thefts.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Peckey, General Traffic Manager, stated that there were many thefts on the railway and they were increasing every year. As to the cause it was impossible to get a satisfactory answer. His own opinion was that thefts were rife because people knew how easy it was to commit thefts from railway premises. High prices were also a contributory factor. Twenty years ago people would not have cared to steal a few seers of gram. Referring to (c) he stated that the Railway Police and not the watch and ward were responsible for dealing with running train thefts. The railway had always held that view which was also shared by the present Superintendent of Police, but it had never been definitely laid down by the higher authorities. He would like to see it definitely laid down that the police were responsible for dealing with all running train thefts and that the watch and ward would deal only with yards, that is, if the present system of police and watch and ward organization was to continue. The District Police should do more than they did by dealing with bad characters and by finding out where bags went.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that pilferages and thefts occurred—(a) in goods yards and sheds of booked and unbooked goods, (b) in transshipment yards, (c) in goods trains, running and stationary in yards, and (d) booked goods. Cases were most frequent under (c) and least under (d). Only cases which came under Police cognizance were reported to, and enquired into by, them. He considered that all cases of theft except very petty ones should be enquired into by the police.

Mr. Green, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, thought that forty out of every hundred consignments booked from Carnac Bridge were tendered in defective bags, that is torn and cut.

Mr. Jhunjirji, Station Master, Biroda, stated that thefts and pilferages from (c) running trains, were the most common form of crime due to the fact that there was no proper protection. There was no staff accompanying goods trains. On certain sections which were notorious for thefts special police patrols accompanied goods trains. The system had been found effective, but would have been much more effective if the men patrolling the trains had been under the direct control of the guard and the Traffic Department. At present the Police were independent of the guard and the railway generally; for instance, if a train was held up outside a station for signals or some other accident, the policemen on guard might leave the train whenever it pleased them and the guard had no voice in the matter. He had not found that the District Police did anything to help the Railway. Unless the Railway Police asked for assistance the District Police never offered it spontaneously.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Name of officer.		Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager	...	(a), (b), (c)	(d)
" Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent	...	(a), (b), (c), (d)	...
" Henderson, Traffic Inspector	...	(a), (b), (c)	(d)
" White, Station Master	...	(a), (b), (c)	(d)
" Datta Row, Station Master	...	(a), (b)	(c), (d)

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that pilferages and thefts from goods sheds, transhipment yards and goods trains were fairly frequent. They occurred mostly in certain defined areas. Pilferages were not very frequent upon passenger trains, nor were thefts in the ordinary sense. Losses took place from traffic booked by passenger trains and a certain amount was due to theft and pilferage upon the train, but most of it was considered to be done at the stations where the traffic was handled. The Police did not take cognizance of such cases until a definite complaint was lodged. If the goods were of an unidentifiable nature, investigation was declined. The measures the Police took to prevent such losses were not known and they were not apparent.

Mr. Gordon, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that from a preventive point of view, he thought that the Police might have some detective agency to ascertain where the goods were going to, irrespective of particular cases. For instance, at Salt Cotours, the railway lost about Rs. 2,000 worth of property monthly. Apart from the question of any particular consignment, Rs. 2,000 worth of goods was going somewhere. It was lost. If the Police were in touch with what was going on, they might have got on to the track of some of the property. The Police received statements of losses from the railway every week. The list was not a comprehensive one, but was merely sent to give an idea as to what losses were taking place. Where losses took place, the Police were only too ready to put off the investigation on some legal or technical grounds. For instance, in some cases they said that the matter was beyond their jurisdiction, or due to short-loading. In one case, piece-goods worth Rs. 600 were loaded in a wagon at Guntakal to Salt Cotours. The Police when referred to, stated that the goods were short-loaded, but that particular bale of piece-goods had not come to light anywhere. The question of theft did not seem to have received the attention of the Police. In cases of short-loading, the presumption was that if the thing was not loaded, somebody must have taken it. He was in favour of some system by which the Police would spontaneously on report make enquiries into shortages when they became very frequent at particular places. There were a large number of shortages reported. The only chance of the railway finding out whether a theft had been committed was to make enquiries at once. The present system was that the railway had to make out a case for the Police to take action. They would not register a case until they had obtained details. If thefts were to be stopped on the railway, every possible means must be adopted. A few years ago, the Railway Police Superintendent wrote strongly objecting to a case referred to him because the goods were afterwards found to be misdespatched, that is to say, it was a case which should not have been reported to the Police. On one occasion six bundles of piece-goods went astray. The matter was immediately reported to the Police, and it was subsequently found that the bundles were misdespatched. But the presumption to start with was that it was a case of theft. He thought that there was no chance of detecting cases unless they took the matter in hand at once. He did not think that the interference would be resented by the local railway staff. The suggestion if carried out would certainly cause an enormous amount of work for the Police. He cited specific cases in which he thought that enquiries might be made:—

(1) In July 1920, five bales were booked from Armenian Ghat on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway to Madras. The wagon arrived at Bezvada without the seal card on the wagon. The seal itself was reported by the railway staff to have been intact. They did not check the contents of that wagon, but put a fresh seal card on the wagon and sent it on to Madras. When it arrived at Madras, three bales were reported short. He wrote to the Superintendent, Railway Police, on the 18th October, that these goods worth Rs. 4,750 had gone, and expressed the opinion that it was a case of short-loading in view of the report from Bezvada that the original seal was intact. The reply from the Superintendent of Police, dated the 25th October, was "I note in your opinion the loss is due to short-loading which is beyond my jurisdiction." In that particular case he did not report to the Police as a case of theft, because he

... the goods were not sealed or sealed in a way that was not sufficient to prevent further pilferage. It was also found that the goods were not sealed in a way that was not sufficient to prevent further pilferage.

2. Upon No. 23 from Guntakal, Salt Cotton, and other salt-intact. It was found that the goods were not sealed in a way that was not sufficient to prevent further pilferage. It was also found that the goods were not sealed in a way that was not sufficient to prevent further pilferage.

Mr. Pereira, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that when he mentioned that pilferages and thefts from (a), (b) and (c) were not frequent, he was referring to his own jurisdiction, which included Marmagao Harbour (Portuguese Territory) down to Mysore Territory and up to the boundary of the Great Indian Peninsula at Hoogli. When a definite complaint was made to the Police, action was taken, but where the goods were of an unidentifiable nature as in the case of grain, etc., investigation was not proceeded with. The Police apparently required extended powers. The Police were very handicapped, e.g. where cloth was unidentified. For instance, if one of the watchmen saw a man extract a piece of cloth from a bundle, and pointed out that man to the Police, the latter apparently had a clear case which they could take to the Court. The policemen, however, did not see the man extract the piece of cloth, and because of these limitations the Police did not take up such cases.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, stated that pilferages of (a), (b) and (c) were frequent. They had been on the increase since the war stopped. Unless written complaints were made, the Police did not take cognizance, but practically little or nothing was done by them to prevent such cases. "I consider they should realize that prevention is better than cure."

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, stated that (a), (b) and (c) thefts had increased considerably in the past 4 or 5 years, due to the rise in the price of foodstuffs and failure of crops in some districts. All cases of theft were reported to the Police, but unless the goods found on the offender could be shewn to have been removed from a certain consignment, the Police did not take cognizance. The Police should take cognizance in every case, whether the property lost was booked or not.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tankur, stated that the Police did take cognizance when cases were reported, but the measures taken to prevent such losses were not sufficient at road-side stations, as the Police came on duty only during train time, and were absent at all other times. He thought that the Police should be present day and night to prevent such cases.

South Indian Railway.

Names of Witnesses.				Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager	(b) and (c)	...
Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager
Mr. Hignman, District Traffic Superintendent	(a)	(b), (c) and (d)
Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector	(a), (b), (c), (d).	...
Mr. Meritt, Station Master	(b), (c)	(a), (d)
Mr. Aiyar, Station Master	(a), (b), (c) and (d).

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, referring to (a) stated that thefts from unbooked consignments for which the Railway Company were not responsible did not come to notice as a rule, but there were thefts from booked consignments, both before and after despatch. Pilferages and thefts were frequent from transshipment yards (b). Pilferages and thefts were also frequent from (c) goods trains, particularly in certain localities where trains ran slowly up steep and long gradients. Where such thefts were frequent the Police sent guards for such trains. Referring to (d), the Railway had had cases, but presumably not more than other Railways, and such cases were reported to the Police.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, stated that there had been pilferages and thefts under all the items referred to. Cases were referred to the Railway Police who took cognizance and made enquiries. Any suggestion given by the Police with a view to improving matters was accepted and given effect to by the Railway. In cases, however, where deficiencies were noticed from seals-intact wagons the Police had asked the Railway not to advise them, as the sending station who issued necessary documents after due check were liable for such cases.

Mr. Hignman, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that thefts and pilferages from (a) were frequent. There was very little theft or pilferage from (b) transshipment yards except at one station. There was a certain amount of (c) running train thefts on certain sections of the line. Some years ago thefts from 1st and 2nd class passengers' luggage (d) were frequent but with the new design of vehicle used on the railway with no foot-boards and windows with expanded metal screens, thefts had been considerably lessened. Travelling Railway Police constables frequently patrolled the corridors of 1st and 2nd class passenger carriages.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, stated that pilferages and thefts under all heads were frequent. He thought much could be done in preventing this form of crime by more vigilant supervision on the part of the police.

Mr. Ramachandra Ayar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, stated that the Police took action if a written complaint were given. He was of opinion that the Police should take measures to prevent such losses without being requested by the railway to do so and that it was the duty of the officers of that department to see that this was done.

East Indian Railway.

Name.	Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Hindley, Agent	Railway material..	
Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager	(a), (b); (c), (d).	...
Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer	(b), (c)	... (a), (d).
„ Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent	(b), (c)	... (a), (d).
„ Harrison, Traffic Inspector (a), (b), (c), (d).
„ Hamilton, Goods Inspector	(a), (b), (c), (d).	...
Nabu Kalka Pershad, Station Master	(c)	... (a), (b), (d).

Mr. Hindley, Agent, stated that the most serious symptom in regard to crime against railway property at the present time was the extensive theft of wagon fittings which had grown up in the last few years. The result of this widespread mischief had now become most serious and in regard to the East Indian Railway alone the number of wagons which were from day to day out of action in consequence was very heavy and caused a serious reduction in carrying capacity. Not only were numbers of wagons rendered unfit to run until repairs could be effected, thus wasting wagon capacity and blocking sidings, but the out-of-course stops to goods trains due to axles running hot (a direct consequence of tampering with the axle boxes) had caused a serious dislocation of traffic all over the system. The difficulties in the way of making good the stolen articles or even adopting simple methods of prevention were magnified by the fact that under the general pool wagons from all railways and of many different types came under the influence of this mischief. Thefts first became extensive as a result of the high value of all metal fittings during the stage of the war when imports ceased and the demand for munitions material was heavy. At first thefts were confined mainly to brass fittings belonging to the vacuum brake gear and these were consequently replaced first by cast iron and then by steel parts as rapidly as possible, but not before a very large number of vacuum brakes had been put out of action.

The thieves then turned their attention to easily detachable iron fittings such as bolts and nuts. The Munitions Board were buying large quantities in the open market and small workshops in all the large towns were given contracts. In many cases these contracts were fulfilled, it was believed, only to a small extent by legitimate manufacture, the balance being secured by wholesale and organized pilferage from railway wagons.

One Railway which was in need of bolts and nuts to make good the deficiencies caused by these thefts actually bought a supply in the open market amongst which were found a number marked with its own identification mark. The matter of identification of such simple fittings as bolts and nuts was always difficult and unless a thief were caught red-handed there was no chance of securing a conviction. The only satisfactory instance of a conviction known to him was one in which the nuts stolen possessed an almost unnoticeable but perfectly definite identification mark caused by a defect in the machine in the East Indian Railway Workshop which had manufactured them. The removal of bolts and nuts from axle-boxes led to the theft of cotton waste and oil from the box itself and this became so prevalent on some sections of the line that the removal of the bolts and nuts and covers became merely the means of obtaining the contents of the axle box. Thousands of wagons had thus been stripped of their axle box covers and the necessary packing, while for a considerable time it became impossible for the manufacturing workshops to keep pace with the drain of material that occurred. The following figures would indicate the importance of these depredations on railway property during the last three years on the East Indian Railway:—

	1917-18.	1918-19.	1919-20.
Axle box face plates	66	55,562	85,588
Bolts and nuts	2,251 cwt.	1,176 cwt.	1,993 cwt.
Cotton waste soaked in mineral oil	6,350 „	12,657 „	19,335 „
Cotton waste soaked in castor oil	964 „	1,192 „	1,326 „
Cotton waste	958 „	1,937 „	3,381 „
Castor oil	19,142 gallons.	24,428 gallons.	24,702 gallons.
Mineral oil	75,103 „	154,842 „	233,197 „

Various devices were now being introduced to prevent the removal of the bolts and nuts and covers, but when it was remembered that the number of goods vehicles on the East Indian Railway was 37,000 and that owing to the general pool and the heavy coal traffic practically the whole of the wagon stock of all broad-gauge railways passed over the system at frequent intervals it would be seen that any measures of a practical nature which could be taken would take time to succeed in coping with this trouble. During the past year even detachable fittings such as brake-blocks, brake-rods, screw-couplings, vacuum brake hose-pipes, etc., had become subject to the attention of the thieves and the Railway might be said have become the general purveyor of iron and steel to the scattered communities along its line of country, while great

ingenuity had been displayed, particularly in the neighbourhoods where there were local smiths and metal works, in adapting wagon fittings for household and other purposes. The principal step taken to prevent these thefts had been to render fittings non-detachable, and a great deal of work had been done in this direction. It would seem, however, that the trouble could not entirely be eradicated unless protection could be secured for wagons when in out-of-the-way places such as the sidings in the coalfields. It was believed from careful checks which had been made that a great deal of the thieving took place in the coalfield sidings and the difficulty was that even when the worst sections had been marked down there was no co-ordinated police authority which could be set in motion. The Railway Police was said to have no jurisdiction over these outlying sidings. The District Police were either powerless or did not appreciate the importance of the matter, and the colliery owners could not be made to take any responsibility while the number of wagons dealt with and the area over which they were daily scattered prevented the railway taking any special means of protection while the wagons were left in the sidings for loading purposes. Even if the high cost of sending a responsible man to remain all day with each wagon or group of wagons could be faced it was doubtful whether such a method would be effective. The Railway Police should be definitely given jurisdiction over the sidings and should have adequate staff effectually to police them and there should be definite co-ordination between the Railway Police and the District Police directed towards the detection and conviction of criminals, who had so far carried out their depredations with impunity. If it were possible to obtain legislation for the colliery areas similar to that in force in Calcutta and Howrah, which would facilitate convictions when possession of railway material was proved, great assistance would be given to the Police in putting a stop to these thefts.

Colonel Sheridin, General Traffic Manager, stated that pilferages took place from goods sheds of both booked and unbooked goods, also from transshipment yards, goods trains and passenger trains. The Railway Police did not take cognizance of such cases until the matter was brought to their notice and all possible evidence was placed before them, nor did they take any action to prevent such losses. The Police should certainly take measures in that direction.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, stated that thefts from (a) were principally from booked goods and were not frequent; (b) thefts were perpetrated in transshipment yards; (c) goods trains formed the chief feature of losses; (d) thefts of booked luggage were not frequent. The police took cognizance of cases when reported to them, but did not to his knowledge take any measures to prevent losses. There had been frequent thefts of luggage in passengers' possession. Police guards travelled by trains, but he had never known them to prevent or detect thefts. More supervision was necessary in this respect. Station Masters did not object to the Railway Police moving about in goods yards. They did not consider that the Railway Police were interfering with them.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, stated that there was very little theft under (a). There were frequent thefts under (b) and (c) and not many under (d). The Police took cognizance of the cases when they were brought to their notice. They did not appear to take any measures to prevent them. They should do so. Prevention at any time was far better than cure.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, stated that such thefts were very few.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, Mokameh Ghat, stated that pilferages and thefts were frequent in all the classes and the Police took cognizance of cases when made over by the railway staff, but nothing was done by them to prevent such losses. It was part of their duty to do something themselves.

Babu Kalka Pershad, Station Master, Jumma Bridge, stated that thefts and pilferages from (a) and (b) were not frequent, except from those places which were not closed; (c) running train thefts were numerous; (d) were very few in number. The police took cognizance when the cases were reported to them, but police constables who travelled with passenger trains did not take the trouble generally to watch, but lay down in the carriages and only came out at stations to get their names recorded by the station constables. On the whole the supervision of the police was unsatisfactory.

Mr. Harris, Goods Superintendent, Howrah, stated that railway thefts might be classified as follows:—

- (1) organized train robberies with or without the connivance of the railway staff;
- (2) thefts from outward sheds before goods were accepted for despatch;
- (3) thefts from outward sheds after goods were accepted for despatch and waiting to be loaded.

(Railways would not accept liability for Item 2 but would do so for Item 3.)

- (4) thefts from van goods trains;
- (5) thefts from inward sheds while goods were in hand awaiting delivery;
- (6) thefts of fittings from railway stock.
- (7) Petty thefts which the labouring classes did not look upon as wrong; for instance, removal of a few pieces of coal from open trucks or picking up pieces that might have fallen in the yard through oscillation in shunting operations.

- (8) stealing sweepings of grain and other foodstuffs from sheds or slitting bags to obtain what was required ;
 (9) tapping wagons through crevices with sharp instruments.

The principal commodities stolen were piece-goods, hides, wines, brass-ware and *ghce*.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Not frequent.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, stated with regard to (d), that there were a number of thefts of wagon and carriage fittings most of which were done by the Locomotive Department employees. There was no remedy except by substituting cheap fittings so that people might not be tempted to steal, and to have an efficient watch and ward.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, stated that on receipt of information the police made enquiries. Measures for prevention did not come within the province of the police and in his opinion this was not a duty for the police but for the watch and ward.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

				Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Coates, Agent	(b)	(a), (c), (d)
„ Gilmore, Traffic Manager	(b), (c)	(a), (d)
„ Minahan, Traffic Inspector	(a), (c)	(b), (d)
„ Dench, Station Master	(a), (b), (c), (d)
Babu P. M. Das, Station Master	(a), (b), (c), (d)	...
Mr. Gundry, Electrical Engineer	(d) carriage fittings.	...

Mr. Coates, Agent, stated that routine action was taken by the Police who might give more assistance.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that the Police were only called in in important cases and in cases in which the railway staff appeared to be involved. The Police Report was only of value in isolated cases. As a rule the stereotyped reply was “no trace”. The Railway Police took no measures to prevent losses as they maintained that their duties were confined to law and order. He considered that the Police should assist the Railway in keeping down thefts and pilferages.

Mr. Gundry, Electrical Engineer, said that he was more concerned with the theft of electrical fittings from carriages. In this connection he knew of no case where the actual thief had been detected by the Police. He thought that the Police generally should take more effective measures to prevent theft. He was of opinion that the employment of policemen on the electrical staff would greatly assist in the detection of thefts. In addition policemen should be engaged to travel with local trains on which most of the thefts occurred.

Mr. Stringer, Carriage and Wagon Examiner, said that thefts of nuts from wagons lying in goods sheds and thefts of appointments from passenger trains were common and were committed by outsiders.

Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, Serajganj, stated that the Police took cognizance of pilferages and thefts reported to them but they did not appear to make a vigorous enquiry. They never took preventive measures which he thought that they ought to do.

Mr. Dench, Station Master, Santahar, stated that there were a few cases at his station last year which were perpetrated by his own staff, the watch and ward and jemadar abetting.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

				Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager	(c)	...
„ Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent	(c)	(a), (b), (d)
„ Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent	(c)	(d)
„ Janes, Station Master	(b), (c)	...

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that the majority of thefts occurred from (c) running trains and were confined to particular localities. The view of the railway in these cases was that punitive police should be quartered on the localities concerned or that villagers should be enrolled as special constables. The efforts, however, of the Railway Police did not seem to receive any considerable support from the District Police or the local civil authorities. Lately a system of deputing clerks from the Commercial Branch of the Traffic Manager's office to the two principal stations of Chandpur and Gauhati had been introduced. These men were entirely independent of the station masters and watched the work on behalf of the Traffic Manager's office. They were deputed for a limited period.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that thefts from (c) were heavy and frequent. The Railway Police did not take cognizance of such cases unless specially requested to do so.

Mr. Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Calcutta, agreed and mentioned that running train thefts practically all took place between certain points.

Mr. Jones, Superintending Station Master, Chhapra, mentioned that the largest number of thefts occurred in (b) transshipment yards. Theft from (c) running trains had also been numerous.

Babu M. Ghosh, Station Master, Goalpara, stated that thefts while not frequent were not rare. Theft cases were reported to the Police who took whatever action they thought necessary. Detections were very rare. He could not say if the activity of the Police in any way influenced the number of thefts.

North-Western Railway.

	Frequent	Infrequent.
<i>Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager</i>	(a), (b), (c), (d)	...
„ <i>Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent</i> (b), (c)	(a), (d)
„ <i>Schodde, Assistant Traffic Superintendent</i> (a), (b), (c)	...
„ <i>Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial</i> (a), (b), (c), (d)	...
„ <i>Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta</i>	(a), (b), (c), (d)
„ <i>Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore</i> (a), (b), (c)	(d)
„ <i>Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad</i> (b)	(a), (c), (d)

Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager, stated that the Railway Police took cognizance of the cases that were reported or came to their notice. Exceptionally bad cases were brought to notice by special letters or reports. The Police investigated cases and reported results to the railway specially when successful. If the cases were not successful the railway was not always informed of the result. In his opinion the Police tried to do the best they could considering the amount of crime and the staff at their disposal. Telegraphic intimation was sent to the Police until recently when orders were received that they did not want telegrams, but only wanted information in Form A. He was of opinion that all cases should be reported to the Police and that it would be quite feasible to do so without troubling them with unnecessary cases. Undoubtedly in some cases it was of no interest to the Police if one bag was short. It might be short-loaded. When however the railway said that one bale of piece-goods was missing and another bale was tampered with it was a matter of swindling somewhere and called for action by the Police. In 1915-19 the Railway paid over half a lakh of rupees on account of theft of piece-goods from Karachi. Wagons continually arrived short by four or five bales. If the attitude was taken up that when the seal was intact the Police could not interfere, it became a serious matter.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, referring to (a) stated that on the whole very few cases had come to his notice of goods booked or unbooked being stolen at a goods shed (excluding transshipment stations). At Karachi Bunder Goods Booking Station there were no thefts from booked consignments which were loaded into a wagon before they were booked, or in other words, before a railway receipt was issued. This had been the practice in Karachi for years because the railway had one shed in which booked and unbooked consignments were placed and there was nothing to prevent *mukadilams* and coolies from picking up any consignment and walking off with it. It was really done in the interests of railway so as to protect them from claims. Referring to (b) he stated that pilferages and thefts from booked goods were only numerous at transshipment stations. He referred mainly to Hyderabad where during the year 1920 there were 187 cases in which claims were made due to shortages and thefts attributed to Hyderabad. Referring to (c) he said that during the year 1920 there were 168 cases in the province of Sind and claims amounting to Rs. 21,562 were paid by his office. Twenty-four cases occurred in which claims amounting to Rs. 2,325 were repudiated. In the Punjab there were 120 cases in which claims amounting to Rs. 12,169 were paid and 42 cases in which claims amounting to Rs. 10,384 were repudiated. The total number of cases in which shortages were reported from seals intact wagons were 673. In his opinion these shortages were due more to short-loading than to theft. Often extra packages were received from upcountry; the sender had made good the deficiency. It was due to the sender loading up a wagon and the station master giving him a clear receipt on the understanding that if there was anything short the sender would have to make good the shortage. In many cases the sender did not bother about the matter. These 673 cases were ones of actual shortage on which the Railway paid claims. The senders in these cases did not make good. In these cases his office reported the shortages to the District Traffic Superintendent concerned upcountry who perhaps kept a record of them. The claims were not paid automatically. The Missing Goods Register would be called for from the sending station to see that everything was correctly sent. Then an enquiry would be made to see whether the wagons were received with seals intact or not at the station concerned and then either the station master would be debited or a case would be recorded against him and the matter reported to the District Traffic Superintendent concerned. Only in large cases where Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,000 had been claimed were elaborate enquiries made as to whether there was or there was not any short-loading. He himself dealt with big claims of sums over Rs. 500 and his Assistant dealt with smaller claims. The Karachi City Station Master had power up to Rs. 100, the Cantonment Station Master up to Rs. 50; at Jungshai and various little

stations the station master had also powers to pay up to Rs. 50. Enquiries were made in anticipation of claims as soon as a shortage was reported. He did not think that the fact that goods were booked at owners' risk exonerated the railway from the necessity of making enquiries; enquiries were always made. Referring to (d), he stated that thefts and pilferages from passenger trains of luggage and parcels were not numerous, at least very few cases came to his notice. He excluded from this remark pilferages from egg and fruit consignments which were easy to pilfer. He was not aware of any measures taken by the Police to prevent such losses but he thought that steps should be taken. If only train thefts (c) could be stopped it would be seen that actual thefts at stations were very few. Pilferages took place at (b) transshipment stations, but it was very difficult to fix responsibility and to suggest a remedy.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that he was not aware of any special measures adopted by the Police to prevent such thefts.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, was also not aware of any measures taken by the Police to prevent such losses and thought that they should take some such steps.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, stated that the Railway Police took cognizance of such cases when reported to them, but it was seldom that the result of their investigation was satisfactory. To his knowledge no satisfactory measures were adopted by the Police to prevent such losses. It was desirable that the Police should take action provided that they were made to work according to the system suggested in his reply to Questions Nos. 13 and 15, otherwise their interference would be more detrimental than advantageous to the Traffic Department. What he complained of was the lack of energy. They generally took no interest in such cases. They dropped enquiries before they really obtained any result. As a remedy he suggested that the Police should be under the Traffic Department; at present they were absolutely independent. The Station Master, Traffic Inspector and even the District Traffic Superintendent had no control over a Police constable with the result that as the Sub-Inspector was never on the spot many important matters were overlooked. He would have them under the District Traffic Superintendent for all matters. When a case was handed over to the Police the result was always unsatisfactory. The records would show that out of many cases reported very few had been traced. In many cases the railway staff felt disinclined to bring anything to the notice of the Police for fear of being intimidated. If any clerk was concerned in a case he would rather pay the claim than make a complaint to the Police because the very first thing the Police would do would be to search his house.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, stated that pilferages and thefts were light on the whole. The Police took cognizance of important cases.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, stated that railway thefts might be roughly divided into three heads: (a) Theft by organized gangs of thieves who usually went in for wholesale robbery from running or standing goods trains. These thieves were generally helped by former railway servants who had been weeded out of railway service for bad work or suspected connivance at thefts. They supplied the technical knowledge required by the thieves and their operations usually extended over a fairly large area; for instance, recently a series of thefts had occurred in running trains in the vicinity of Chapra, the operations of the thieves extending from about Santa Station to Ekma Station, a distance of 30 miles. Such gangs when formed required special measures to deal with them and a vital factor was that there should be the closest co-operation between the Railway Police and the District Police. (b) Petty pilferages by persons other than railway servants. This form of theft was common, but the pecuniary value of the goods stolen was not great. This type of theft awaited opportunity and consisted of petty pilferages from goods booked and unbooked from goods sheds, and when opportunity offered, also of the abstraction of grain from loaded and unloaded wagons by means of cutting the bags in wagons through the interstices of the flap doors. The thieves in these cases were mostly of the beggar type who infested stations and managed to pick up a living by begging alms and availing themselves of any opportunity of theft that might arise. (c) Organized or non-organized thefts by or with the connivance of railway servants. This form of theft was the most common of the three, and was the most difficult to deal with. In any case, when a man was suspected, a prosecution was instituted, but he had rarely known of a case in which a conviction had been obtained. Practically the only remedy that the Railway Administration possessed was to watch the work of the staff closely and if thefts at any particular point became frequent, to discharge the men who were responsible for dealing with the goods. In his opinion the Railway Police, more particularly the Bihar and Orissa Police, were too slow in moving. In all cases of thefts or pilferages the occurrence was reported by telegram to the District Traffic Superintendent and a copy of the telegram was sent to the nearest Railway Police Thana, but in Bihar and Orissa no action was taken by the Police until a detailed report was submitted by the District Traffic Superintendent to the Superintendent of Railway Police with a definite request to take up the case. In many cases the enquiries were of a very perfunctory nature. The printed form intimating that "the case had been enquired into and no clue obtained" should be discontinued. The work of

the United Provinces Railway Police was of a more vigorous type and cases were enquired into at once. He suggested that the nearest Railway Police Station should take immediate cognizance of all cases of theft and pilferage reported by wire and that enquiries should be made at once and immediate reports submitted to the officer in charge. It might be said that this would mean duplication of enquiries, i.e. that the preliminary enquiries of both the Railway and the Police officers would run along the same lines, but at the present time much valuable time was lost to the Police and many clues that might have led to the recovery of goods or to the conviction of the thief or thieves were lost through a vigorous police enquiry not being taken up at once.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, Gorakhpur, stated that such thefts were not frequent. The Police took cognizance when a report was made, but apparently no measures were taken to prevent losses. He was of opinion that measures should be taken by the Police in that direction.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, stated that pilferages occurred more from goods at the time of transshipment than from other consignments. The cause might be ascribed to the greater number of people handling the former goods. During the period of the Sonapur Fair parcel traffic was so heavy that the railway could not possibly store all articles in one place. Part of the platform was fenced off and special chowkidars were employed and the Police were also requested to assist by deputing special constables, otherwise parcels traffic at Sonapur was not heavy. All thefts were reported to the Police who however very rarely succeeded in tracing the articles or arresting the culprits. In fact, the enquiries in such cases were usually very perfunctory.

Babu Jank Lal Jha, Station Master, Chhapra, stated that the most frequent complaints came from transhipped goods and each case on arrival at destination was reported by wire to the Police who did not take immediate steps, but waited till the goods were delivered and it was only in cases when a remark was given by the consignee of shortage that they started a slow and generally fruitless enquiry. If the cases were taken up at once there was every possibility of the detection of crime. After successive reports of train thefts a constable was sent out, but not being very intelligent he did not meet with any marked success in preventing crime. Parcels and inward goods were kept securely especially those that were valuable. Only outward goods were exposed which was due to scarcity of wagons. Everyone wanted to send his goods at the same time. They would not spread their consignments over the whole year. The old goods sheds were very commodious and could hold 100 to 200 wagon loads of goods in the shed itself, but at the newly built stations open goods sheds had been constructed which were not so satisfactory.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that thefts of booked or unbooked goods from goods sheds and transshipment yards were not frequent on the Railway and the Railway Police took cognizance of such cases as occurred. (c) Theft from goods sheds were usually epidemic on different sections of the line, but owing to Police action did not continue for a very long period on any one section. (d) Theft from passenger trains were infrequent.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Inspector, stated that pilferages were frequent from none of the categories. Such losses as did occur could be prevented if police constables were posted at points of transshipment where there was most time and opportunity for pilferage.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, stated that pilferages from (a) booked consignments, predominated, but were not by any means large in number. The Railway Police took cognizance, but not in a whole-hearted manner unless hopes were entertained by them of tracing the missing articles. In instances where such was not the case a stereotyped report was sent in and the names of the Traffic staff who were perfectly innocent were given as suspects. This was repeated if other thefts followed, resulting in the clerk or clerks being punished or dismissed. But the failure of the Police to localize the pilferages seemingly went unchallenged.

Pundit Amrit Lal Tewari, Station Master, Budlaun, stated that (a), (b) and (d) were infrequent. (c) Running train thefts were frequent but the Railway Police always took suitable action in the matter.

Question No. 8.—Are pilferages from consignments of particular classes of goods: (a) arms and ammunition, (b) fresh fruit, (c) liquor, (d) fish, numerous on your railway? What, if any, special arrangements are made for the protection of such consignments?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

	Frequent.	Infrequent.
Colonel Anderson, General Traffic Manager	—	(a), (c), (d).
Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent	(b), (c).	(a), (d).
Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly ...	(b), (c).	(a), (d).

Colonel Anderson, General Traffic Manager, referring to (a) stated that guards always padlocked wagons and took special care of consignments using special labels. Special care was also taken of (c) liquor which was locked up.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that fresh fruit was stolen from passenger trains by porters who did the loading and unloading, but they only did this after dusk. The packing was defective. Thefts of (c) were not common as special care was taken.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that pilferages occurred from parcels of fresh fruit (b). Recently a circular order regarding pilferages of these consignments was issued. Piece-goods were placed in locked wagons except those consignments which came from foreign railways.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Bara Banki, referring to 1 (b) stated that he had suggested to the Traffic Manager that fruit vans should be locked up and warehouses should be under the supervision of Platform Inspectors or military pensioners until the consignments were loaded into different vans. Where they were transhipped they should be under the supervision of Assistant Station Masters.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Names of officers.	Frequent.	frequent.
Mr. Rumboll, Agent	(b).	...
„ Alexander, General Traffic Manager ...	(b).	(a), (c), (d).
„ Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager ...	(b).	(a), (c), (d).
„ Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent ...	(b), (c).	(a), (d).
„ Gwynne, Traffic Inspector	(b).	(a), (c), (d).
„ Adams, Station Superintendent ...	(b), (c) (Occasionally).	...
„ Gokhale, Station Master	(b), (c).	...

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, stated that pilferages and thefts from fresh fruit consignments (b) were due to defective packing.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated that a considerable amount of petty pilferage was done from fresh fruit consignments (b), which the flimsy nature of the packing rendered easy. Protection of such consignments came under the general Watch and Ward arrangements.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, stated that when arms and ammunition (a) were despatched, junction and receiving stations were specially advised by telegram. As regards (b), he thought that fresh fruit was frequently stolen owing to the flimsy wicker baskets in which it was packed.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, stated that special precautions were taken for (a), and as regards (c), consignments were kept in parcels offices under lock and key.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, stated with reference to (a) that arms and ammunition were locked and sealed in wagons. With regard to (c) guards were provided with locks to protect wines, spirits and parcels containing treasure or silver.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, stated that when thieves found that they had removed a case containing anything dangerous such as arms and ammunition, they threw it aside. Pilferages of fruit (b), were due to flimsy baskets being used. He had detected several cases of fruit baskets being tampered with by outsiders who had trespassed for the purpose; the exposure of the fruit also tempted railway menials of the unloading staff.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that very few consignments of (a) arms and ammunition were received at Carnac Bridge and no case of theft had occurred among these consignments. With reference to (b) fresh fruit there had been a few instances of pilferages of mangoes loaded loose in full wagon loads in the season. Plantains were the only other fruit traffic received at Carnac Bridge. Consignment of (c) were specially fastened and sealed by the railway.

Mr. Green, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that there had been very few cases of pilferages from consignments of (a) arms and ammunition. Fresh fruit (b) was subjected to petty pilferages. These consignments were sent by passenger train and the vans were locked. Traders were more or less responsible owing to careless packing. There had been occasional cases of theft of (c) liquor. The firms that sent liquor now took proper precautions in the way of packing and sealing their own consignments and for some years there had been very few claims to pay on this head. With reference to (d) fish, the traffic was mostly local. The owners, generally the fishermen, brought the fish themselves and there was no possibility of pilfering.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, stated that pilferages from (b) fresh fruit vans, were frequent at large transshipment stations or big booking stations where traffic was heavy. The loaders, if there was no proper supervision, were responsible for these thefts.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

				Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager	(a), (b), (c), (d).
„ Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent	(a), (b), (c), (d).
„ Henderson, Traffic Inspector	(a), (b), (c), (d).
„ White, Station Master	(c)	(a), (b), (d).
„ Dutta Row, Station Master	(b), (c).	(a).

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that cases of pilferage from arms and ammunition were practically unknown on the Railway. Cases of (b) occurred very occasionally. Pilferages from (c), liquor consignments, were not heavy, but a certain number were reported. There was always considerable doubt as to whether these pilferages actually occurred upon the Railway. Very few cases of (d) occurred. Special arrangements were made to safeguard twist and cloth parcels sent from Madras to the North-East line. These parcels were given individually to the Chief Guard of trains and were passed on under separate signature to destination. This step was necessary owing to the heavy losses during 1920. Consignments of *arrack* from different distilleries were sent in the care of the Chief Guard owing to frequent cases of broaching the casks in transit. Wagons containing valuable goods were locked while standing in Guntakal station yard awaiting transhipment and despatch.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, stated that he had not come across cases of theft from (a) and (d). Cases of (b) and (c) occurred, but not frequently. Food grains, oils and *ghee*, piecegoods and twist, sugar and jaggery and such edibles were usually stolen.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, stated that special arrangements were made for the conveyance of consignments of (a). Consignments of (b) were pilfered to a certain extent; in most cases they were extracted by the menials to whom fruit was a luxury. (c) Cases and casks of liquor were weighed on receipt from Foreign Railways and at stations. Thefts were frequent from such consignments, but they were invariably done so carefully that it was a difficult matter to detect. The only way in which extractions could be discovered was from the difference in weights. The offenders removed the clips from the sides of the cases without cutting the wires.

Mr. Dutta Row, Station Master, Tumkur, stated that cases of (a) were nil. (b) and (c) occurred for want of proper Watch and Ward. These cases generally happened at transshipping stations. During the heavy traffic season, goods were allowed to remain in open sheds. Proper arrangements were necessary to prevent pilferage.

South Indian Railway.

					Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager
„ Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager	(a), (b), (c), (d).
„ Higman, District Traffic Superintendent	(a), (b), (c), (d).
„ Parker, Traffic Inspector
„ Meritt, Station Master	(b), (d).	(a), (c).
„ Aiyar, Station Master	(a), (b), (c), (d).

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, referring to (a) stated that special instructions had recently been drawn out and opportunities were given by all railways for the safe and quick conveyance of these consignments. With regard to (b), (c) and (d) where there were no signs of packages having been tampered with when delivery was effected, it was more than probable that the contents had been extracted and make weights put in before the packages had come into the hands of the railway staff. This was particularly the case in regard to consignments of (c) liquor. These parcels were generally despatched by passenger trains in charge of the guard, who was supposed to keep his brake van locked, and if clear signature was given by guards for these packages and they were found on arrival at destination to have been tampered with, the last guard who gave clear signature was held responsible. That was treated as conclusive evidence. While under training he himself had actually worked as a guard and had never been let down. If one guard did not trust another and a full check would cause detention to the trains, he should take the relieved guard on till the check was completed. As far as the South Indian Railway was concerned, pilferages and extractions mostly occurred from consignments of food-stuffs, cloth, coffee seeds, piece goods, oil, etc., which as a rule were not booked as parcels and were conveyed by goods train.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, stated that pilferages from the particular classes of consignments mentioned in the question were not frequent but occurred mostly from valuable consignments such as foodstuffs cloth, coffee seeds, piece goods, oil, etc. Wagons loaded with consignments of these particular classes were formerly sent under special arrangements from station to station enabling them to be specially safeguarded, such as by locking during night time, but as it was found that by this system thieves were thereby able to locate the wagons containing these commodities with less difficulty and tampered with them, the system was suspended.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, referring to (b) stated that complaints were received, but the pilferages generally occurred on foreign railways outside his district

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, stated that thefts mostly occurred from food-stuffs and piece-goods.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, stated that consignors were requested to send their consignments safely packed and in order to make them realise the importance of packing, they were asked to execute certain risk notes.

Mr. Ramchandra Nayar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, stated that thefts and pilferages from (b), (c) and (d) were very rare as such articles were generally carried by trains in sealed wagons or in vans under the direct charge of the guard and were stored at stations in place not easily accessible to thieves

East Indian Railway.

			Frequent.	Infrequent.
Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager	(b), (c), (d).	(a).
Mr. Presswell, District Traffic Manager	(b), (c), (d).	...
„ Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent	(b), (c), (d).	(a).
„ Harrison, Traffic Inspector	(b), (d).	(a), (c).
„ Hamilton, Goods Inspector	(b), (d).	..
„ Kalka Pershad, Station Master	(b), (c), (d).	(a).

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that pilferages from (a) were practically nil. Special action was taken in dealing with such consignments. The packages were kept locked in a strong room until the time they were despatched when they were taken to the brake-van by special European or Anglo-Indian officials who handed them over to the guard of the train and took the guard's signature on the special guidance on which special packages were entered. The guard kept such consignments under lock and key and personally gave delivery *en route* taking the signature of the person to whom he gave delivery on the special guidance in his possession. All packages containing arms and ammunition were kept under lock and key from the time of receipt at a station to the time of delivery. Pilferages from (b), (c) and (d) did occur. The measures taken to reduce theft from such consignments were to despatch them by through trains as soon after arrival as possible. At destination special arrangements were made to give platform delivery as soon after the train arrived as possible so that the number of handlings was reduced. In the case of (c) liquor consignments, they were kept under lock and key as far as possible until delivery was effected.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, stated that thefts principally occurred in (b), (c) and (d) for which no special arrangements were made.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, stated that : (a) never occurred ; (b) were enormous, (c) and (d) very great. "It is very difficult to protect articles like fruit, liquor and fish because numbers of coolies, railway menials and others infest all stations in India. Practically all railway menials are thieves. The police constables are not much better and there is no doubt that they steal fresh fruit in the same way as the railway menials do. Crime of this description does not appear to be regarded as a crime in India."

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, stated that there were very few thefts from (a) as special arrangements were made to deal with these consignments. Thefts were very frequent from (b) fresh fruit, and (d) fish consignments, but were not frequent from (c) liquor consignments. All possible care was taken of these consignments by the station staff and the guard of the train.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, Mokameh Ghat, stated that (a) never occurred, (b), (c) and (d) occasionally. Special arrangements, if adopted, would only increase the work and responsibility indefinitely.

Babu Kalka Pershad, Station Master, Jumna Bridge, stated that special arrangements were made for (a). Any special arrangement, if adopted, would increase the work and responsibility indefinitely.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, mentioned that pilferages from (a) were nil. Special arrangements were made for the carriage of arms and ammunition. Pilferages from (b), (c) and (d) were not numerous. Thefts from fresh fruit parcels were the most numerous and fresh fruit merchants were continually advised to attend to the proper packing of such parcels as faulty packing was the chief cause of thefts. Recently the Railway Conference agreed that if merchants used proper wooden boxes for packing fresh fruit parcels they would be returned free to the sending stations, but this opportunity was not being availed of, apparently owing to the extra expense entailed. There were no rules in force about piece-goods being sent in locked wagons. About four years ago, however, owing to a gang of thieves operating between Calcutta and Khargpur the Company purchased 2,000 locks and every wagon between Shalimar and Khargpur was locked after

which an outbreak had never occurred. He was not in favour of having all wagons locked because a great deal of inconvenience would be caused unless there was an universal lock. Shortages were due to various causes such as insecure packing, weak sewings with single and old gunny bags and consignments being made unduly large which made them difficult to handle during transhipment.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

				Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Coates, Agent	(b)	(a), (c), (d).
Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager	(a), (b), (c), (d).
Mr. Minahan, Transportation Inspector	(d)	...
Mr. Dench, Station Master	(a), (b), (c), (d).
Babu P. M. Das, Station Master	(b), (c), (d)	...

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that (d) arms and ammunition were carried under special arrangements and pilferages were practically non-existent. There was a certain amount of pilferage from (b) fresh fruit consignments but the extent was not large and steps were taken to keep it down by means of supervision at transhipment points, quick transit and prompt delivery. Senders of small consignments of fresh fruit and vegetables contributed very largely to pilferage by not using sufficiently strong and secure means of packing. (c) Pilferages from consignments of liquor were formerly numerous but since special steps were taken to guard against pilferages the number had been considerably reduced. He admitted that his subordinates did not seem to be aware of the existence of the special instructions. (d) No complaints were received and it was understood that pilferage from boxes and closed baskets was negligible. In regard to small fish sent in open baskets it was presumed that merchants allowed for a certain amount of pilferage.

Mr. Minahan, Transportation Inspector, stated that pilferages of piece-goods, ghee, sugar and brass were numerous. The railway staff and the police were responsible.

Mr. Dench, Station Master, Santahar, stated that complaints were formerly received of pilferages of fresh fruit, fish, and vegetables. In order to stop them he ordered a special watch to be kept over trains carrying such consignments with satisfactory results. A few cases had been detected in which the railway staff or coolies were the culprits and they were summarily discharged from the service.

Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, Serajganj, stated that no special arrangements appeared to be made.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

				Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager	(b), (c), (d)	(a)
„ Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent	(b), (d)	...
„ Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent	(b), (d)	(a)
„ Janes, Station Master	(b), (c), (d)	(a)
Babu M. Ghosh, Station Master	(b), (d)	(a)

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated with regard to (d) that whenever fish vans were run from point to point the vans were locked and this procedure was also possible in some cases of fresh fruit traffic. He himself had seen at Chandpur stuff taken out of a locked van which had been pilfered to the extent of twenty-five per cent. The pilferage was presumably done before loading. Loading at Chandpur was done practically by daylight in front of everybody. To his mind there was very little chance of pilfering there as after the stuff was loaded the key was sent to the Station Master.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that fruit and fish wagons were locked when heavy traffic justified separate wagons being used.

Mr. Janes, Supervising Station Master, Chandpur, stated that when large consignments of (d) fish were booked they were loaded into wagons which were sealed and locked. Small consignments were loaded into the brakevan and placed in charge of the guard.

Babu M. Ghose, Station Master, Gauhati, thought that pilferages of (b) fresh fruit and (d) fish were due to the insecure nature of packing. Pilferages of ghee, oil and edible grains were also numerous. Special care was taken of (a) in the way of stricter supervision and telegraphic advice of movements.

North-Western Railway.

				Frequent.	Infrequent.
Mr. Roalsh, Traffic Manager	(b), (c)	(a), (d).
„ Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port	(b)	(a), (c), (d).
„ Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims	(b), (c)	.
„ Jordan, Traffic Inspector	(a), (b), (c), (d).
„ Foster, „ „	(b), (c), (d)	(a)
„ Ryan, Station Superintendent	(b), (c)	...
„ Mool Chand, Station Master	(b), (c), (d)	(a)

Mr. Bonith, Traffic Manager, referring to (a) stated that consignments were carefully protected under the rules laid down in the Traffic Manual and Goods Tariff. Referring to (b) he stated that for fresh fruit packages Traffic Sub-Inspectors were sent out in the fruit season at junction stations to watch transshipment and to report and prevent shortages as far as possible. Referring to (c) he said that liquor and spirits were tampered with to a certain extent though special precautions were taken and orders issued that making over and taking over of such packages should be particularly carefully done. Liquor cases and packages were locked up in goods sheds or parcel offices whenever possible. Regarding the suggestion that in regard to parcel traffic more could be done in the way of having cages on platforms, he stated that in such stations as Delhi where the traffic was heavy the whole platform would have to be enclosed, so also No. 6 Platform in Lahore. If it were caged it would be practically impossible to use it for anything else. The suggestion, if adopted, would mean rebuilding special parcel platforms.

Mr. Hadow, Agent, referring to the same question of cages stated that there was the difficulty that parcels which came in by ordinary train did not always arrive exactly at the same spot. Some sort of travelling cage would be required which would encumber the platform and leave little room for passengers. Regarding the suggestion that something might be done by means of plain clothes detectives, the objection which could be raised was that inasmuch as most pilferages from fruit parcels were believed to be done by the railway staff the latter would quickly get to know the detectives.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, stated that special arrangements had been made for protecting piece-goods. Wagons containing such consignments were riveted if booked to a station where there was a Carriage and Wagon Examiner; if booked to other stations they were locked. All piece-goods wagons were despatched from Karachi by one train and chowkidars accompanied the train as far as Dadu where they were relieved by other men who took them on during passage through the Sukkur District. This system had undoubtedly reduced the theft of piece-goods very considerably and should be widely extended to other valuable traffic such as ghee, oil, eggs and shoes.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, stated that pilferages had been most frequent from consignments of (a) fresh fruit (b) liquor, boots and shoes and piece-goods. Chowkidars were employed for watching consignments at the time of transshipment and on passenger platforms, but otherwise parcels and goods were left in the hands of coolies moving them from one platform to another or from one train to another.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, did not consider that pilferages from the classes of goods named were numerous. There was not much trouble in connection with pilferage of fresh fruit. There was very little object in the railway staff stealing fruit because in the case of liches and mangoes, for instance, which were the chief fruits transported by the Railway they did not require to steal them. In season they were available in great numbers and were very cheap. The claims for fresh fruit were practically nothing.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Scnepur, stated that traffic in (a) was so small that it might be ignored; (b) fresh-fruit traffic sprung up at regular seasons and was specially dealt with. To avoid thefts of fresh fruit, consignments were, as far as possible loaded into sealed vans and forwarded to the farthest possible station before being re-sorted and transhipped. For instance, during the lichi season wagons were forwarded from Mirzapore direct to stations such as Lucknow City, Benares City and Allahabad. The wagon for Benares City would contain packages for Benares City and adjacent stations. Pilferages from such consignments were not very great considering the volume of traffic carried during the short period. Thefts of (c) and (d) were small.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, stated that pilferages from (a) were nil; from (b) numerous; from (c) and (d) occasional. Owing to the frail packing of fresh fruit and fish consignments it was difficult to prevent pilferage but these consignments while awaiting despatch were guarded by chowkidars and others of the station staff.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Scnepur, stated that pilferages from (a) were nil, from (b) and (d) were very infrequent; considering the amount of traffic dealt with there was a very small percentage of thefts. (c) Consignments of liquor were sometimes pilfered but such cases were rare.

Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra, stated that (a) and (c) were nil; (d) very seldom; (b) cases were not numerous. The time allowed for handling traffic was not much and the detention was nil. Through wagons were run to the last junctions and the packages dealt with promptly. In the fruit traffic season extra men were appointed for the work and if consignors would only look after their interests by packing up consignments securely in baskets with gunny covering and by properly labelling them no complaints would arise.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that of the commodities named, fresh-fruit (b), was most subject to pilferage which was largely on account of the insecure system of packing

adopted. Fresh-fruit vans were run when justified by the volume of traffic offering and severe penalties were imposed on railway employees found guilty of pilferage or negligence. He did not think that pilferage could be stopped unless strong baskets were used.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Inspector, Utrims, stated that pilferages from (b) fresh fruit and betel leaves were numerous. Special circular letters had been issued warning the staff to exercise greater caution in taking over such parcels as if they could not satisfactorily prove that they had not been negligent, they became liable for a portion of the compensation paid.

Mr. Gardiner, Station Master, Bareilly City, stated that thefts of (b) fresh-fruit and (c) liquor were chiefly perpetrated in transit, particularly at junctions where there was a break of gauge. Circulars were issued generally impressing upon the staff the necessity of examining such goods carefully when making and taking over charge.

Pandit Anant Lal Tewari, Station Master, Bulahn, stated that thefts and pilferages were not numerous from any of the categories at his station.

Question No. 9.—Are reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons made to the Railway Police for enquiry? If not, how are such cases dealt with, and what is the system of investigation in cases investigated by the railway authorities? What are the main difficulties encountered?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, stated that generally reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons were not made to the Railway Police for enquiry. As regards fixing responsibility on the railway believed to be responsible for the loss and as regards payment of compensation to the owner of the consignment in cases where compensation was due, clear rules were laid down in the Indian Railway Conference Association rule book. In cases where compensation was legally due to the owner the place where the wagon was tampered with was located and the railway on which the tampering took place was held responsible and was required to pay the claim or to accept debit when it was paid by the delivering railway. In regard to the system of investigation, both the delivering railway and the responsible railway on receipt of information regarding a case started an enquiry. Claims Inspectors were sent out to the stations concerned who investigated the case, inspected merchants' books and railway records, interviewed cartmen and took all possible steps to locate the responsible persons. In the case of shortages found in seal-intact wagons the Indian Railway Conference rules placed the blame on the sending station and in case of a receiving station falsely stating that a consignment had arrived short retaliation would undoubtedly take place in due course, so that the method acted fairly in the long run.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that the Police took cognizance only in important cases; such cases were disposed of under Conference Rules as regards foreign railways. As regards the Railway itself the practice was to punish the sending station. Heavy shortages were specially investigated by Claims Inspectors.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, stated that the Traffic Manager, Claims, at Headquarters dealt with these cases. District Traffic Superintendents did not hear very much about them in the Districts. The Traffic Manager, Claims, had Inspectors who made enquiries.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumbold, Agent, stated that reports were not made to the Police; the loading staff was held responsible. The clerk in charge was debited with the cost of that portion of the goods found to be missing. Sometimes a mistake occurred in loading. Packages were wrongly counted, but such mistakes were usually rectified after investigation. In their enquiries, the railway first endeavoured to find out what had actually happened to the missing goods. All wagons that were loaded on the same day as the missing packages were checked with a view to seeing if the packages had been wrongly loaded. Fortnightly returns of all missing goods lying in excess at stations were received at the head office and the Claims clerks when he received a claim referred to the statements to see if the missing packages were lying at any other station on the way. He often found such cases. If the missing package was not traced the loading clerk was held responsible. He thought that about 50 per cent. of the missing goods cases were traced.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated that reports were not made to the Railway Police for enquiry. The forwarding station was held responsible. A deficiency message was issued by the receiving station addressed to the sending station and the Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial. No difficulties were encountered in dealing with such cases.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, stated that shortages of missing goods from seals-intact wagons were not reported to the Railway Police for enquiry except in special cases. Investigation was made by correspondence and in special cases enquiries were made by Inspectors who visited the spot. No special difficulties were encountered.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Julgaon, Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, Rao Saheb G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master (Goods), Poona, agreed generally with the above witnesses.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that the Police were not advised. Reports were sent by wire to the sending station and transshipment junction station, if any district officers being included and a Discrepancy report with all particulars was submitted to the Traffic Superintendent.

Mr. Green, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that the Police always maintained that such shortages were not due to thefts and had asked the Railway not to report such cases. A summary was sent to the police every fortnight of all shortages due to theft and they were kept informed of the actual state of affairs on the line and the amount actually being paid out in claims. The Railway procedure in such cases was as follows. For instance if Carnac Bridge, a destination station reported shortage, the goods agent wired to the sending station and then sent his report with the seals to the office. On receipt of the forwarding station's report, notes were made on the case if there was anything suspicious or if any undue delay was noticed on the part of the destination station in unloading a wagon and reporting the shortage. Then the case was treated as one of short loading against the forwarding station. A tabular statement of such cases was sent to the District officers monthly to take any action they considered necessary against the staff. The main difficulty experienced was to localize the shortage. Once that had been done, the result followed automatically. That was the only method adopted and was one universally recognized on all railways.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons were reported to the Police when there was reason to think that a theft had occurred. The railway staff could not possibly say whether a shortage was due to theft or short loading and the presumption was that it was a case of theft at the forwarding station. In cases where the loss had not been reported originally to the Police by the staff, it was reported by the Claims Office. The Police usually regarded these shortages as due to short loading, but although the goods were not found, the question of theft did not seem to receive the attention of the Police. The cases were also investigated departmentally. The usual line followed was to see to what point the goods might have been missent, and to circulate the description and also to scrutinize the reports of goods in excess. Departmental Claims Inspectors investigated cases also, but they had not Police powers. The main difficulty was in proving that a theft had occurred in time to enable the Police to make enquiries.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons were not made to the Police unless theft was suspected. In the case of shortages from seal-intact wagons the loading station was held responsible and the staff was punished as circumstances demanded.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, stated that reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons were made to the Police. Usually a copy of the telegram reporting the shortage was given to the Police and followed up with a complaint. The Railway made enquiries into all cases either through the Traffic Inspector, a special Inspector, or the District Traffic Superintendent personally. The Police did not want reports until the Railway was certain that a theft had occurred and then it was often too late for any good to come out of it. The Police did not act with sufficient smartness. They wasted time and often property disappeared in the meantime. They got sufficient information that something had gone wrong, or that some crime had taken place—sufficient information to justify their taking action under the powers of the Criminal Procedure Code. On the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, whenever there had been a case of broken seals, in 90 per cent. of the cases there had been theft.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, stated that reports were made to the Police. Enquiries were also made by the receiving stations, Traffic Inspectors and District Traffic Superintendents. The difficulty was that forwarding stations always reported consignments "correctly forwarded".

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that such cases were dealt with under Conference Rules where foreign traffic was concerned and in accordance with Traffic Working Orders as far as local consignments were concerned. The former were reported to the sending railway who were liable under Conference Rules for any claim. In cases of owner's risk consignments, presumably foreign railways investigated such cases; whether they reported them to the Railway Police or not was not known. With reference to local traffic, the sending

station was held responsible for any claim that might arise. These cases were not reported to the Railway Police but were covered by Conference Rule 28 and Traffic Working Order 420. In regard to all enquiries with reference to shortage the real object of the enquiry if the goods could not be traced was to find out who was, under the rules, responsible, and if the rules made him responsible owing to his having signed something, it was not open to him to deny responsibility although he could not be convicted in a criminal court. The rule was only a rule of thumb. Some time ago complaints were made by the Traffic Manager of the Port Trust of the numerous cases of shortages in seals-intact wagons booked from Madras harbour. He had asked the District Traffic Superintendent to make surprise checks before the wagons reached their destination. This was done and shortages were discovered which proved short loading at the harbour. Such surprise checks were also made by Goods Supervisors. These checks were made after the goods were loaded in wagons and before they reached their destination. A Goods Supervisor who had finished his work at a particular station or junction and might have to wait for some time for a train occupied such time by checking the contents of some of the through wagons in the yard.

Mr. Rowbottom, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, stated that reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons were not made to the Railway Police. Immediately upon discovering a deficiency in any consignment whether in sealed wagons (with seals-intact or otherwise) at a forwarding, intermediate or receiving station all work with the consignment or wagon ceased until the Station Master or the Assistant Station Master on duty had been called to the scene and by personal investigation had satisfied himself that the deficiency had not occurred at his station. Advice of loss of a package or consignment was given by the station noting the shortage to the sending or last tranship station by telegram tendered for despatch within 6 hours of the time at which the wagon was opened. When the loss was estimated to amount to Rs. 50 and over in the case of foreign consignments and Rs. 100 and over in the case of local consignments, a copy of advice was given to the General Traffic Manager also. The particulars of despatch of the advice in regard to the deficiency was also recorded in the register called the "log register" by the Station Master personally and the register was kept in the Station Master's office. The Station Master receiving the deficiency message would himself make immediate enquiries at his station and submit without delay a report in the prescribed form with a timed copy of the deficiency message received to his own District Traffic Superintendent as well as to the District Traffic Superintendent of the district wherein the original reporting station was situated if the reporting station was in another district. If the bag or bags reported short had been left behind, the sending station would advise all concerned of the fact by wire and forward the bag or bags. Upon receipt of the deficiency reports, the District Traffic Superintendent or in his absence the Assistant Traffic Superintendent would arrange for an immediate investigation into the real cause of the loss by a specially deputed official where the circumstances of the case were not of sufficient importance to warrant a personal enquiry. If on enquiry loss was located to be due to short loading at the sending station or unauthorized removal at the receiving station the senders and consignee's records were scrutinized and after satisfying themselves that the claim preferred was genuine, steps were taken to pay. If the station against which shortage was reported was on a foreign railway, liability was notified to that railway. The staff at the sending station were held liable for shortages in seals-intact wagon and were punished either by transfer, reduction or debits in accordance with the merits of the case. No difficulties were encountered. He thought that the practice of not reporting cases of shortages from seal-intact wagons was sound, because the station master who loaded the wagon was responsible for the correct load in the wagon.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that information was given to the Police. The papers were handed over to the District Goods Supervisor for special enquiry and he was authorized, if necessary, to proceed to any point on any other district or foreign railway in order to complete his enquiry.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, stated that reports were not made to the Police. The Railway Department made enquiries, officers being deputed according to the value of the consignment missing.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, stated that reports were not made to the Police. Generally the sending station or the last handling station whose seals were found to be intact was held responsible. Investigations were made by District Officers through Goods Supervisors and Traffic Inspectors. The main difficulty was to prove whether the articles found were actually despatched or not from the station where they were last handled.

Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, stated that enquiries were made in accordance with Traffic Working Orders 420, clauses 3 and 9, and 14.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that reports of shortages from seals-intact wagons were only made to the Railway Police when there were reasonable grounds for supposing that theft had taken place. Departmental enquiries were made in such cases. Seals were called for and certified by an officer in the superior grade. Enquiry was directed at the receiving end as to the date, time and train by which the wagon arrived, where it had

stood, how long after arrival it was dealt with, who supervised the unloading, whether the shortage was reported to the sending station, and whether there was any indication as to how the theft was perpetrated. Enquiry at the sending end was directed towards ascertaining whether a full consignment was received, where it was placed, who weighed it, who marked it, who loaded it and who sealed it, whether there was any indication that the seal was removed after loading and theft committed and then the wagon re-sealed, or whether there was any indication of misdespatch. The main difficulty in dealing with theft from a seal-intact wagon was to determine clearly whether the consignment was short despatched or if the receiving station had misappropriated the goods and made a false report against the sending station.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, stated that in such cases the Police did not undertake enquiry unless the loss was of a nature in which identifiable goods were concerned. Such cases were dealt with departmentally. The investigation was directed towards ascertaining who dealt with the consignment and to punishing him. The difficulty was to find the culprit. Generally railway investigations did not go beyond localizing an offence. The enquiry could not be as minute as that made by the Police. It was a summary enquiry directed towards localizing responsibility. It had not been his experience that other Railways rendered little assistance in enabling the East Indian Railway to get to the bottom of cases. In important cases he had found it of no use to write official letters. He always wrote demi-officially and had always secured a prompt reply and co-operation. He had had occasion to send Inspectors to other railways.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, stated that reports were made to the Police usually within three hours of the theft being discovered but in the majority of instances the cases might not have been reported to the Police for all the effect that the report had. Cases had also occurred in which the Police had prosecuted the staff, but they had been acquitted when the case went to Court. The Police worked under great disabilities in this respect because the public were not on the side of law and order but usually sympathized with the thief and in consequence it was almost impossible to detect crime of this nature. The railway authorities endeavoured to trace consignments and locate the thief, but this was exceedingly difficult to do as the thieves were very clever in cutting off seals so that the wagon might travel 200 or 300 miles without a broken seal being detected. Experiments were being made with safety locks of different kinds.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, stated that the Police were informed and enquiries were also made by the Railway authorities and the culprits were punished if detected.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, stated that no case was taken up by the Police. This was a very important question which required looking into. There was nothing to stop a dishonest Station Master from wiring that he had received certain goods short when actually the consignment was received in full.

Babu Kalika Prasad, Station Master, Jumna Bridge, stated that reports were made in every case. The results of Police enquiries were seldom made known to the reporting officers or stations.

Mr. Harris, Goods Superintendent, Howrah, stated that Police enquiries took a long time to complete, hence numerous claims were held up. Some system should be introduced by which Police reports came in more quickly.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, stated that all cases of shortages from seal-intact wagons were reported to the Police but they took no cognizance of such shortages found at the destination station as the sending station or the last sealing station was held responsible according to the Conference Rules. If the seals, however, were found broken in the yard after arrival but before unloading the Police took cognizance. Police enquiries were instituted at the sending stations or last resealing station and the station that last resealed the wagon was held responsible unless it could be proved that the theft took place from a running train or in an intermediate yard. Enquiries were also made by Railway Claims Inspectors. He held very strong views in this matter. Even if an entire package was found short in a seal-intact wagon there was no reason why the Police should not intervene. It was just possible that theft had taken place at the despatching station and it was quite easy for the despatching station to despatch one package less and report the theft at the receiving station. The Police demanded proof of the theft first. He thought that it should be assumed that the theft must have taken place from the wagon.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that reports were not usually made to the Police, unless the packages indicated that they had been tampered with. A departmental investigation was always made to ascertain whether there was any defect in loading, unloading, tallying, etc. The main difficulties experienced were that the despatching or transshipment station asserted correct despatch, whereas the receiving or transshipping station asserted short receipts or damage. If the conditions laid down in Conference Rule 28 were found to have been properly complied with it was held that the station which last sealed the wagon was

responsible unless it was known that the shortage occurred elsewhere. The number of claims against the railway in 1917-18 was 8,150 cases; in 1918-19 it was 12,065 cases and in 1919-20 it increased to 14,517 whereas the amount of claims admitted had steadily gone down. The increase in the figures was due to the establishment of speculative claims agencies. A record of cases was maintained in which different stations reported shortage and efforts were made to localize. If a destination station was in the habit of reporting shortages in respect of consignments arriving from different points suspicion fell upon that destination station and a watch was set.

Mr. Menzies, Transportation Inspector and Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, Serajganj, stated that reports were made to the Police.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that such cases were ordinarily entrusted to Claims Inspectors for enquiry. He was of opinion that much valuable time was lost by this arrangement and that by the time the Claims Inspector's enquiries were finished, it was too late to begin the police investigation. It was generally difficult to trace the point of loss. During the year 1920, there were 8,249 cases of loss and only in 2,478 cases were claims made.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent and Mr. Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Commercial, agreed with Mr. Cooper.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Booth, Traffic Manager, stated that reports of shortages from seal-intact wagons were not usually made to the Railway Police for enquiry. Wires were sent to the forwarding stations to accept liability and copies of those wires were as a rule made over to the Police at the station where the shortage was discovered. The general attitude of the Police had been to decline to take action as such cases were probably due to short loading or defect on the part of Railway Staff for which the Police were not directly responsible. When shortages became excessive special reports were made and the Police were asked to investigate. Stations maintained a Shortage Register of consignments received in seals-intact wagons from which Inspecting Officers could judge how shortages were progressing. A large number of cases were investigated by Claims Inspectors. The figures in his possession showed that in 1919, 5,507 cases and in 1920, 9,029 cases were investigated by Inspectors. In all these cases men were sent out. A part of the investigation was made on the spot. They went out to the stations where shortages occurred and traced cases back. For instance, in the case of a Goods Clerk who deliberately shortloaded and made away with a couple of bags of wheat and then sealed and despatched the wagon, if subsequently a case of short loading was reported the Claims Officer would ascertain whether the sealing was properly done and whether the loading was correct and would probably get an answer in the affirmative to both. All that would result would be the debiting of the sending station with a certain amount. The man who actually loaded would be held responsible for the wagon and his name would be sent up together with his defence and he would be debited with a certain amount. It would be taken for granted that the shortage had occurred at the sending station because the seals were intact at the receiving station. In a case of this sort the railway authorities would not go so far as to debit the whole value because there was very considerable probability that the loading clerk was not the man who was really guilty, so that he would be debited with a very small proportion of the value of the consignment which he had as a matter of fact misappropriated. It was really a paying thing for the clerk to do once or twice, but thereafter he would be debited with the full value of the consignment. Unless there were special circumstances such as a series of shortages from a particular station what the railways applied was a rule of thumb method which located responsibility. They could never assume full responsibility because they were aware that they might be punishing an innocent man. Sometimes if the investigating officer's report showed carelessness all round a certain amount would be debited to the menials. If the staff showed that they had correctly carried out their duties, that it was an exceptional case and that it was probably a mistake, then no debit would be made at all. The orders were that a member of the staff was not to be debited with more than 1-8th of his pay and any debit of more than Rs. 5 had to go to the District Traffic Superintendent in charge of Claims. Occasionally a man might have 2 or 3 debits. His pay was never cut to such an extent that he would get no pay. The debit would be spread over a period of time.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, stated that important cases were investigated by Commercial Inspectors: sending stations were held responsible for any loss. The difficulty was to treat such cases as thefts. He thought that some cases were due to carelessness on the part of the booking staff and other cases to the goods staff being over-worked. When once a case was made over to the Police it was left entirely in their hands. The case was simply reported to the Police. The file in the Railway Office was not sent to them.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that reports of shortage or deficiencies from seal-intact wagons as a rule were not made to the Railway Police because they declined to investigate such cases attributing them to short-loading or mis-despatch on the part of the sending station. The sending station was held responsible under Conference

Rule 2S-A and deficiencies were at times made up if the goods had been found to be left behind. Cases had arisen where shortages had occurred from wagons the seals of which to all appearances were intact. They had been so cleverly tampered with or forged that they practically defied detection. Owing to long halts in transit it was difficult to ascertain where such tampering took place and police investigation in this direction was not usually successful. During 1920 the number of cases dealt with by the Claims Branch amounted to 13,082. This number was exclusive of cases where claims were preferred and were either paid or repudiated, but consisted of cases where consignments were traced, subsequently received or otherwise settled. The number of cases in which shortages were reported and subsequently received would be approximately 1-6th of the total of 13,082, i.e., about 2,000 cases. Merchants were informed of cases attributed to running train thefts after a report had been received from the Police. Merchants had no access to these police reports, nor did they often call for them. On one occasion one of the Oil Companies in Karachi wrote asking what was the result of the Police enquiry and the information was given. Last year 3½ lakhs were realised from the sale of property deposited in the Lost Property Office.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, stated that the main difficulty in such cases was due to the fact that the consignor was in league with the forwarding station staff and obtained receipts for goods which were neither loaded nor brought to the station-premises, but no evidence was forthcoming.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, Karachi, stated that reports were made to the Police only in important cases where there had been loss of valuable property. The results of such enquiry had been unsatisfactory and the loss to the Railway had been enormous. Investigation by the Railway was carried out by the agency of Commercial Inspectors. The system of joint enquiry by the Police and Commercial Inspectors had proved helpful. The main difficulty was that the security of goods in transit was dependent on labels and twine instead of on substantial locking arrangements for wagon doors.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, stated that investigation into such cases was necessarily governed by various circumstances. If packages were actually left behind forwarding stations invariably got them and gave numbers of subsequent despatch. If not, the Claims Section dealt with each case on its merits. The principal difficulties to the best of his knowledge were the inability to get the staff to give clear and definite replies promptly to enquiries made. "The more promptly you can deal with cases the quicker you can get to the bottom of them. If there is any hanky-panky the men are bound to dodge you."

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, stated that the chief difficulty was to find out the real culprit. According to rules the sending station was responsible in such cases, but there were instances in which the receiving stations had been found to have reported shortages from seal-intact wagons falsely; on the other hand in several instances the sending stations had subsequently made good the reported deficiencies. These facts showed that in many cases innocent men must have been punished and this defect could only be remedied either by utilizing the services of detectives or ordinarily by referring to the register maintained at each station showing the shortages reported against stations in order to judge the probability as to whether theft could have been committed. Claims Inspectors should, instead of being utilized for office work, be put in charge of sections on which they could move about freely taking in hand matters of this kind for immediate enquiry and action. Similarly, the Traffic Inspector should take an active part in such cases. They did not concern themselves with such matters with the result that practically there were no Inspectors on active duty. Matters would greatly improve if his suggestions were adopted and there would be no necessity for the so-called help of the Railway Police. He suggested the transfer of a few Claims Inspectors to the Railway Police Department in which case it would be possible to supply the Police with an interest which was at present lacking. This arrangement would also improve the working of the Police and guarantee that they expedited enquiries which otherwise they would not do.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, stated that cases were reported only when it was almost certain that a theft had been committed and that the theft was not of a petty nature. Important cases were traced by Traffic Inspectors who called in the assistance of the Police when necessary. The Bihar and Orissa Police were markedly unwilling to assist without orders from their Superintendent. Police assistance was largely a matter of personality. "Where a wide view of the expression 'reasonable suspicion' is not taken, we cannot hope for much co-operation." There was no pecuniary limit in the matter of investigation. It was a bad practice to put a financial limit on such matters. Cases were dealt with by the Railway as follows. If, for instance, a loading clerk deliberately loaded one package short and had the wagon sealed and sent off and the shortage was discovered at the receiving station, the Traffic Inspector would at once be sent down to investigate the case. He would take the statement of the staff and examine them. He would examine the books and possibly the carters and men who brought the package and do the same at the destination station if possible and convince himself as to whether there was any reasonable suspicion of a deliberate theft. Then in the end the Traffic Inspector might have to send the case to the Police with a full report.

It was no use sending on the case simply stating that it was believed that something was stolen. Details must be given and if possible the Traffic Inspector should personally see the Police. There was no system of black mark on the Railway. Most districts maintained a register of cases of seals-intact shortages, from which they noted the particular stations from which cases were being reported, and if a case such as that which was mentioned above occurred the register would be examined with the object of finding out against whom such cases were occurring, and it was at this point that the assistance of the Police was necessary in order to find out who these persons were, where they were living and who were their friends. This procedure only applied to identifiable packages such as piece-goods. In the case of grain, etc., the Traffic Inspector was not called in but the case was registered against the station. When the staff was available it was proposed to centralize the Claims Section of the Railway which would give District Officers time to attend to their legitimate duties, would relieve them of unnecessary correspondence and would ensure continuity in the method of enquiry and the tabulating of cases. At present the Traffic Inspector could not devote sufficient time to his legitimate duties. He was always in Court or was enquiring into claims cases. He could not exercise any proper control or supervision over station masters. Regarding the allegation that there had been hundreds of cases in which police investigation had been cut short because the railway authorities refused to allow open delivery until a Claims Inspector or a Traffic Inspector was present, which meant a delay of several months sometimes he stated that station masters of standing and established integrity were allowed every discretion in the matter of opening consignments.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, stated that thefts and pilferages from seal-intact wagons were not enquired into by the Police. Their attitude was that the very fact that a shortage was noticed from seal-intact wagons had localized the occurrence and it was a matter for the Railway Administration to deal with. Such cases were enquired into by the Railway and in most cases the staff were dealt with more or less severely according to the nature of the case. He was of opinion that the investigation of claims should be taken away from Traffic Inspectors. They had too much of that sort of work to do which could be better done by special Claims Inspectors who would work under the Traffic Manager. This would give District Officers and Traffic Inspectors more time to devote to general supervision which would help to prevent the occurrence of shortages and pilferages in consequence of which claims were lodged. In many cases of theft the chances of detection were prejudiced through the Police delaying to institute enquiries on the ground that a preliminary investigation should first be made by a Traffic Officer to show that there was reasonable suspicion of a crime having been committed. It was not the business of the Police to trace missing consignments for the Railway, nor did the Railway expect them to take up such enquiry; but they did feel that a more generous interpretation of what constituted "a reasonable suspicion" should be applied and the Police should show greater willingness to take up investigations without loss of time.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, stated that reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons were made to the Police for enquiry; the Traffic Inspector also instituted an enquiry and reported to the Railway. Clues as to the actual perpetrators could not be obtained and the police enquiry was not helpful. The Police were too slow in making enquiries into cases of theft. With reference to the allegation that investigations were delayed because the Railway Authorities would not allow open delivery without the presence of the Traffic Inspector he stated that he had been working on the line for about 20 years and had not experienced a single case where the Police had asked him to witness the opening of a pilfered package or consignment. He would be only too glad to help the Police if asked to do so. Traffic Inspectors and the Police conducted their enquiries separately.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, stated that shortages from seal-intact wagons were reported to the Police but the enquiries made by them in such cases very rarely led to any results. The Traffic Inspector also enquired into such cases and submitted his report to the District Traffic Superintendent. The main difficulty encountered by the Police and the Traffic Inspector was to get a clue to the perpetrator or perpetrators of the thefts.

Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra, stated that each case was reported by telegram to the Police who delayed till the consignment was delivered, apparently to find out whether the goods had been taken over on a clear receipt, or they came and asked a few questions of the railway staff as to the time the wagon arrived, the nature of the contents and the consignee's name and address. All that the railway staff could see was apathy but the Police asserted at the same time that confidential action was being taken, which, as time passed, appeared to be fruitless. With regard to the allegation that there was delay in giving open delivery he thought that there might be a delay of 4 to 10 days, as sometimes the Traffic Inspector had too much to do and could not come to the station immediately.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that shortages from seal-intact wagons were not formerly reported to the Railway Police, but this was now being done with the object of placing the Police in a position to know what was taking place at different stations. He approved of the system recently introduced and thought that the Police ought to know what

was going on. He did not wish them to make enquiries into cases, but merely to maintain a record so that they might know the excess at certain stations. Conference Regulations placed responsibility for such shortages on the sending station provided telegraphic notification was given promptly by the receiving station. This was not a satisfactory mode of settlement, but it was surprising to what extent the fear of reprisals acted as a deterrent to false reports of shortages. According to the rules for open delivery the condition of the consignment was reported to his office and the Sub-Inspector was then sent out. He did not authorize station masters, except Europeans at large stations to give open delivery.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Inspector, Claims, stated that the Conference Rules were sometimes abused by the staff at receiving stations.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, stated that Conference Rule 28 placed a premium on dishonest dealings on the part of receiving stations who were given the opportunity of misappropriating goods knowing that they were fully protected by issuing a wire or wires intimating shortages which did not exist. The Railway Police made superficial enquiries and were only too ready to prove that the deed had not been committed at their stations and thus avoid filling their Crime Register with cases.

Question No. 10.—What is the difference between the arrangements made for the safety of:—

- (a) goods at owner's risk, and
- (b) goods carried at railway risk ?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

No difference.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, stated that there was no difference between the arrangements made for the safe custody of goods carried at owner's risk and those carried at railway risk. The intermediate staff did not know whether a consignment was booked at owner's risk or at railway risk. The goods clerk alone at the forwarding station knew it. The public did not know that consignments of fruit or military stores were always booked at owner's risk. Shortages in military consignments had mainly occurred in goods booked to Bombay which had suffered from running train thefts. Shortages in military consignments were also often due to mis-counting at forwarding stations. The loading was generally done by the sender, and often in sidings remote from the regular goods platform.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, and Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, agreed that there was no difference between the arrangements made for the two classes of consignments.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, stated that no difference was made except in the case of ammunition, silver and insured articles, when wires were issued to junction and receiving stations.

Rao Saheb G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, stated that there was no difference except for insured or railway risk articles specially booked at railway risk which were kept under safe custody to prevent damage.

Bombay Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that no separate arrangements were in force.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, stated that equal care and attention was paid to goods at owner's risk as was paid to goods booked at railway risk, because the risk note was taken only for the condition of the goods and not for their protection. The proportion of cases in which it was found necessary to take risk notes was about 5 per cent. The thief could not know whether a risk note was taken or not. For instance, taking a dozen different consignments lying on a station platform, it could not be said which packages were booked at owner's risk and which at railway risk. That information was only available in the books. There was no mark of any kind made on the consignments. Consignments were accepted by one man and loaded by another, so that the loader himself did not know which consignments were sent at owner's risk and which were not. Where the rates were alternative and people wanted to take advantage of the lower rates, they also booked at owner's risk. He did not think that it was easy to surmise from the packing of the parcel whether it had been booked at railway risk or at owner's risk. Once the ordinary parcel left

the booking clerk, it was not easy for anyone to say whether it was booked at railway risk or owner's risk. Fruit parcels however were usually booked at owner's risk and this was known to all the railway staff.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that no difference was ordinarily made in the arrangements for the safeguarding of traffic carried at owner's risk and at railway risk. The only difference was that when valuable consignments were insured the railway took special steps, such as consignments of gold from the Kolar Gold Fields. The railway staff did not know what class of goods were generally sent at owner's risk. Rates were constantly changing and many articles carried at owner's risk were also carried at railway risk. The only people who knew that were the goods clerks and the station masters. If the things were robbed from a running train, the railway was exempt from liability under risk note form B, but theft from a running train was a legal point which was at present under reference to the High Court of Bombay.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that practically all goods were sent at owner's risk, where there was an owner's risk rate. There was no difference in the treatment of the two classes of consignments. The handling staff were not aware in the case of ordinary goods at whose risk they were booked or carried. Piecegoods were generally carried between most large centres at owner's risk.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, stated that there was no difference. The consignments were stored and carried together.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that there was no difference. There were special local instructions in regard to the care before, during and after transit of valuable and insured goods.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, stated that there were not two sets of rules; one for goods booked at owner's risk and another for goods booked at railway risk. The staff were expected to exercise the same care in accepting, loading, unloading and custody of goods booked at owner's risk as with those booked at railway risk.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that as a matter of fact unless the invoice was seen it could not be known whether a consignment was booked at railway risk or owner's risk.

Messrs. Parker, Traffic Inspector, Meritt and Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Masters, agreed.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that both were carried under the same arrangements.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, stated that he did not think that there was anything in the suggestion that railways did not exercise the same amount of care when investigating claims arising from owner's risk consignments as they did when examining those sent at railway risk. Investigation was practically a matter of form. The same procedure had to be adopted whether the consignment was booked at owner's risk or at railway risk except that investigations regarding railway risk consignments did not occupy half the time of those at owner's risk. In the case of consignments at railway risk the Railway settled the claim at once after enquiring whether it was a case of running train theft or not. In the case of owner's risk consignments enquiries had naturally to be extended. In the case of owner's risk consignments the Railway paid for the loss of complete packages only and not for pilferage. In the case of running train thefts, the onus of proof lay on the Railway through the Railway Police. There was no difference. All goods received the same care. Speaking without figures before him he was of opinion that the East Indian Railway allowed fully 65 per cent. of their claims. The kind of evidence that was secured by the Railway showing that it was a case of running train theft was as follows:—The place where the seal was found deficient was located; the guard was examined to see where he last checked the seals. When he came to a changing station, he had to fill in a form showing that it was correct when he took over charge. If a package was not loaded into a train it was not a running train theft. If it was suggested that so long as the train was in charge of the guard the presumption was that the man in charge must have committed the theft he repudiated the idea because he did not think that a guard had any facilities, nor had he any necessity for robbing, say, a bag of garlic or a bale of piece-goods. It was not possible for a guard to take away a whole bale unless he had accomplices. It was possible, but improbable, that he had abetted the theft. He did not require any further evidence to come to the conclusion that it was committed by an outsider. If the evidence was quite sufficient, the Police would be able to locate. The Railway depended on their investigation and it was on that investigation that the Railway

actually repudiated. No case of a claim being repudiated on the ground of running train theft had been made without a reference to the Police. There had been delays in the matter of open deliveries. That was a matter on which he had asked his Inspectors to pay particular attention, the idea being to prevent or reduce claims for the longer the delay in giving open delivery, the greater the claim became as the Railway had to work on the *bazaar* profits and take the interest also into account. The delays were due to the fact that the Inspectors had a great deal of work to do. The staff had been increased recently. Most of the Inspectors had been engaged for months in Court cases so that they could not move about. The Districts had been recently re-allocated and the number of Traffic Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors had been increased. If there was an important case now, men were available in his office to send them away straight to the spot. European Station Masters were generally allowed to give open delivery.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, stated that there was no difference. The Railway staff knew what consignments were sent at owner's risk and what at railway risk; for instance, fruits and vegetables or perishable articles were generally sent at owner's risk.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that there was no difference. From the figures supplied by the Railway it appeared that on an average day consignments booked from and to stations in the Chitpur District at railway risk amounted to 404 cases while the number booked at owner's risk amounted to 942.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

No difference.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, mentioned that it was a mistake to presume that no enquiry was made in the case of theft of goods booked at owner's risk. No claims were paid on pilferages in consignments booked at owner's risk but enquiries were made in order to localize the pilferage. The staff found responsible were then dismissed. He did not think that if the risk note system were abolished, there would be any material reduction in pilferages and thefts as the Railway was taking a reasonable amount of care even in the case of owner's risk consignments.

North-Western Railway.

No difference.

Mr. Hadow, Agent, suggested that there should be a system of insurance. He stated that the staff did not care whether they pilfered from consignments booked at railway risk or owner's risk. As regards pilferage from consignments of fresh fruit, no doubt they looked upon the matter as a sort of legitimate gain. They knew that owing to the fact that a consignment had been booked at owner's risk there would be no lengthy enquiry because the Railway would not have to pay for it.

Mr. Roalsh, Traffic Manager, stated that in practice the Railway lost consignments booked under both risks. The proportion of debits in the case of goods sent at owner's risk was as high as in the case of those sent under railway risk. A large number of cases were enquired into by Claims Inspectors.

Mr. Hawles, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, did not regard the fact that goods booked at owner's risk exonerated the Railway from the necessity of making enquiries. Enquiries were always made.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

None.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

No difference.

Question No. 11.—How far is such pilferage as takes place due to the act or connivance of the Railway Staff?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, stated that both the Traffic staff and the Police were concerned in pilferages.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that most of the pilferage took place with the connivance of the Railway staff, District Police and the Railway Police. The District Police took their share from the thieves. The Railway Police obtained a share because they were on duty in every yard.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, stated that the pilferages that took place were done by the Railway staff with the connivance of the Police staff. With regard to the connivance of the Police staff, he believed that they had a system of toll, the constable demanding a certain amount monthly and the traffic watchmen being told by the constable to make the amount good from consignments. As a rule constables did not take part in the patrolling of goods sheds. He was quite sure that if the railway staff could be persuaded to report cases at once matters could be remedied. Constables had a certain amount of influence. They came along in their uniform and commanded that influence.

Mr. Walsh, Traffic Inspector, Lucknow, stated that pilferages took place due to the act or connivance of the Railway staff. As a matter of fact, outsiders committed the pilferages, but with the connivance of the Station staff—mostly the Watch and Ward men. Outsiders had acquaintances and friends among the Watch and Ward. When the Watch and Ward men were on duty the outsiders came in and learnt from them where particular consignments were. *Pulladars* were also responsible for petty pilferages. When a *pulladar* or member of the staff was found implicated the Station Master was not dropped on. There was no suspicion against guards or drivers in connection with pilferage.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Bara Banhi, stated that pilferages in almost all cases were done with the connivance of Railway staff, Railway Police and Civil Police. One could not do it without the other. The property could not be disposed of in the city unless the City Police were in collusion. His remarks applied also to running trains. Running train thieves did not come from outside. There were Police train guards on particular sections running for years who had their own *clique* of gangs and centres.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, stated that the position on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway was due to the fact that gangs of robbers boarded the trains while on the line. The situation at the present moment was serious and apparently beyond the capacity of the present police force. The railway staff might be taking advantage of these conditions, but that fact had not been so far established.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated that there was reason to believe that the railway staff frequently connived at pilferages if they were not sometimes the actual culprits. Proof, however, was seldom forthcoming.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, stated that there was no doubt that members of the railway staff pilfered consignments and connived at others doing so, but it was not possible to say what percentage of pilferage was due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, thought that in nearly all cases such pilferages as took place were due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, thought that outsiders and railway menial staff together were responsible for such pilferages as took place. Clerks were also sometimes involved. The pay of the loading foreman was at present Rs. 50 at the maximum.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, thought that commodities such as sugar, and fruit, offered attractions to 'handling' labour.

Rao Saheb G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, stated that there were few cases of the kind—about one or two per thousand.

Bombay Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Pechey, General Traffic Manager, attributed most of the thefts to outsiders. He also suspected the railway staff to a certain extent.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that it was difficult to say what proportion of pilferages and thefts was due to the actual act or collusion of the railway staff, but the staff were given to the practice.

Mr. Green, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that he was unable to say definitely how far such pilferages as took place were due to the act or connivance of the railway staff. Most of the offences were in fact committed by outsiders. In trains there was only the guard on the train and the engine staff, both of whom were too busy with their work to indulge in pilfering. At stations it was difficult to say since some trains were held up at sidings at nights for an hour or two and the protection afforded to trains was not at all sufficient. They were perhaps patrolled by two or three *chaulkidars* and the guard. The trains consisted of 60 wagons. It was quite an easy thing for a few men to break the seals in spite of the scanty protection that was given at night. As regards thefts from yards and

goods sheds, he thought that the chaukidars themselves committed pilferages while goods were awaiting transhipment or in wagons which were to be sent forward. On the whole considering the localities where thefts occurred and the fact that there were no railway men about, the natural conclusion that a person would come to was that thefts could only be committed by villagers close to the railway.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, thought that sometimes pilferages were due to bad packing and sometimes to the neglect of the staff but not to the connivance of the supervising staff. At places where contract labour was employed, it was found that the coolies were sometimes responsible for pilferages with the connivance of the Watch and Ward staff; but the Chief Goods Clerk did not connive at these offences.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that there was reason to believe that a great deal of the pilfering that took place was due to the act or connivance of the railway staff, but not necessarily always by the staff actually in charge of or handling the goods, but also by the staff of other Departments. There were menials in the Loco. yards, and there were menials of the Engineering Department and some members of the public too were concerned.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that a considerable portion was undoubtedly attributable to the connivance of the railway staff.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, thought that the railway staff were not responsible for more than 5 per cent. of the pilferages that took place. Outsiders were responsible in most cases.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, agreed with Mr. Henderson. Outsiders came in without the connivance of the railway staff, and sometimes even without the connivance of the menials.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, stated that such pilferages as took place were rarely committed by the railway staff, but generally by outsiders.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that it was difficult to say how far such pilferages as took place were due to the act or connivance of the railway staff. In a number of cases where the railway staff had been held to blame or where the Railway Police reported that they were responsible, suitable departmental action was taken and where the Police recommended prosecution, this was invariably resorted to. The Railway had appointed special Inspectors to put down crime and District Traffic Superintendents had been placed in charge of the distribution of wagons at large stations and for about 2 years there had been no complaints.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, stated that no statistics were available. There had been one or two instances where goods were pilfered by and with the connivance of the railway staff but the proportion was so small that it might be left out of consideration. Pilferages were more due to outsiders who hung about the station. It was not possible to prevent people from coming to the yard as they all said that they had business. The only way to get rid of outsiders was to prosecute them. There was nothing in the law which authorised the Railway to ask merchants and brokers to keep away certain men who were suspected to be bad characters.

Mr. Hysman, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that the question was very difficult to answer. He had personally stopped wagons in transit and had also at different stations supervised the unloading of wagons, but up to date had never found a shortage.

Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, thought that the railway staff and outsiders were equally responsible.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Shersidan, General Traffic Manager, stated that the question was bound up with Question No. 10, that is, to what extent did the railway staff steal from consignments booked at owner's risk being aware that the railway would pay no claim and that they could steal with impunity. The class of railway servant guilty of petty pilfering was generally illiterate and they had no knowledge whether the goods were booked at railway or owner's risk. Any attempt on their part to endeavour to obtain information for the discrimination of goods booked at railway and owner's risk would at once arouse suspicion.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, was of opinion that there was a great deal of connivance on the part of the railway staff.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, stated that the question was an impossible one to answer and that he might as well be asked how far thefts took place with the connivance of the Police.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, stated that it would appear that there was connivance on the part of the railway staff. Merchants were also a great deal to blame. In taking delivery of parcels and goods merchants generally sent low-paid servants who were usually dishonest. These men took over goods under a clear receipt and by the time they reached their masters' premises they found out that pilferage had taken place. His opinion was that many pilferages occurred in transit between the station and the owner's residence. Secondly, merchants did not pack their goods, specially fresh fruit and fish, in substantial baskets. He had often walked to the brake-van and found many such packages broken and the contents dropping out. The only conclusion that the public drew was that there had been pilferages in these consignments. Recently merchants were persuaded to pack such stuff in strong boxes which would be returned to them free of charge by the Railway, but they did not avail themselves of this favour. Another instance was that torn bags once used for grain and seed were again used after being sewn up. The result was that these bags were stuffed with grain to such an extent that they burst and the Railway was required to pay the claims in such cases.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, stated that in almost 95 per cent. of cases pilferages took place as a result of the act or connivance of the railway staff. It was a most difficult matter for an outsider to commit any theft at a station or goods shed, except from the yard at big stations, without the connivance of the staff.

Babu Kalka Pershad Station Master, Jwana Bridge, stated that no theft or pilferage occurred due to the wilful act or connivance of the railway staff. The man in charge might, however, neglect matters for want of time.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, stated that although pilferages by the staff specially from fresh fruit parcels did occur, very few cases of their being actually implicated were detected and brought to light.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Coates, Agent, thought pilferage was probably due to some extent to the act or connivance of the railway staff especially the low-paid staff.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, was of opinion that the railway staff was responsible only to a limited extent.

Mr. Meakins, District Traffic Superintendent, was of opinion that most of the pilferages that took place were due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Mr. Gundry, Electrical Engineer, stated that neither he nor the Police had ever detected any connivance on the part of the Railway Electrical staff but he did not say that it did not occur.

Mr. Minahan, Transportation Inspector, Mr. Dench, Station Master, Santahar and Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, Serajganj, thought that very often such pilferages and thefts as took place were connived at by the railway staff.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

The witnesses were of opinion that so far as petty thefts were concerned they were either done by or with the connivance of the railway staff, but experience had shown that larger thefts were the work of organized gangs.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boulth, Traffic Manager, was of opinion that a large percentage of pilferage that took place at stations occurred with the connivance of the railway staff. Running train thefts were perpetrated by outside gangs, but even in this form of crime the railway staff were more or less implicated or remained silent as the gangs operating were their friends or residents of neighbouring villages.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, stated that it was difficult to say how far thefts were due to the act or connivance of railway staff, but there was no doubt that the railway staff and the Police were implicated and he mentioned some of the cases which had come to his notice.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that the major portion of the pilferages that took place was due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, stated that with the exception of thefts in running trains he thought that in 50 per cent. of cases of organized thefts the railway menial staff were implicated.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, Karachi, stated that many cases of theft and pilferage were due to the acts of the Railway staff which were connived at by the Police.

Mr. Lynn, Station Superintendent, Lahore, stated that pilferages of consignments were almost entirely due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, stated that pilferages on account of the acts of the superior railway staff were rare compared with those committed by the menial staff, especially the handling coolies. If there were any connivance on the part of superior railway staff it was with a view to avoiding claims cases. For instance, if a bag was found torn it would be sewn up in order to prevent its detection by the owner, but so far as his experience went, a member of the superior railway staff would not connive at acts of pilferage if personally noticed by him.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, stated that it was impossible to say how far such pilferages as took place were due to the act or connivance of the railway staff; but inside information was certainly acted upon in many cases.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, said that it was hardly possible to give an opinion on the point, but it was clear in many cases that collusion between the thieves and railway staff existed.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, Gorakhpur, stated that it was difficult to say who were the actual perpetrators of such pilferages, but the menial staff appeared to be concerned.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, said that it was quite possible that some of the pilferages were done with the connivance of the railway menial staff.

Babu Janak Lal Jha thought that very few cases of pilferage were due to the act or connivance of the railway staff. Where such cases were detected the matter was promptly enquired into and was reported to the authorities for punishment or dismissal.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that it was not possible to estimate accurately the extent to which pilferage took place with the connivance of the railway staff, but he thought that they were attributable very largely to them. Theft was improbable by an employee who had taken over a consignment in good condition and whose responsibility for the same depended upon the remarks under which it was transferred to the next responsible party. Opportunity existed, however, for pilferage at the checking stations in the case of a wagon received with defective seals as a prompt report of such shortages freed the staff at the checking station of all responsibility. When possible, the contents of such wagons were checked in the presence of a Police representative, but that representative was not as a rule of a status higher than a constable.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Claims Inspector, expressed the opinion that 75 per cent. of pilferages took place due to the act or connivance of the railway staff.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, thought that about 70 per cent. took place due to the connivance of the staff and 30 per cent. due to the connivance between the sender and his agent. In respect to the latter the sender handed over the consignments to responsible brokers who either during transit or in the merchants' godowns took out small quantities, specially of foodstuffs, and then had the goods conveyed to the goods offices where a small percentage was weighed and the bags loaded. On arrival at its destination the weight of the consignment was challenged by the consignee, re-weighment effected and suspicion thrown on the staff at despatching station.

Question No. 12.—Is there any want of co-operation between different departments of the same railway or between different railways in regard to claims?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, stated that claims work was all done at headquarters so that there could not be any want of co-operation between different departments of the same railway in regard to claims. All foreign railways, however, had their idiosyncracies. Some responded promptly and accepted debits according to rules; others either did not answer letters or refused to accept legitimate debits, but in most cases eventually the case was settled according to Conference Rules. In any case, where a railway maintained its refusal to accept a debit in spite of the Conference Rules on the subject there was always the final resource of going to arbitration before the Traffic Managers' Committee of the Conference Association.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that the Conference Rules had done away with complaints of lack of co-operation between railways. Regarding the disposal of claims station masters had power to settle claims up to Rs. 25 and such claims were generally paid on delivery of goods. Cases above Rs. 25 came up to the District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, who was empowered to pay up to Rs. 500 on his own responsibility. The Traffic Manager and his Deputy had power to pay up to Rs. 1,000. For claims over Rs. 1,000 the formal sanction of the Agent was necessary. Cases coming up to him were settled within a month except certain heavy or inflated claims or in case of consignments booked at owner's risk, because enquiries had to be made and reports received from the receiving and sending stations and *bijaks* from the consignee to test the claims, as the complaints were received with incomplete information causing a good deal of unnecessary correspondence. Merchants did not give details of their claims or submit *bijaks* with their letters. The name of the sending station was often found incorrect and also the number of the railway receipt and date. In Bombay and Calcutta there were several booking offices. Merchants did not give the correct name of the booking office from which the goods were booked. He instanced the case of a man who booked 500 bags of rice and claimed for short delivery of 10 bags valued at Rs. 100. The Claims Section had first to ascertain the accuracy of his statement from the sending and receiving stations and to compare the amount of claim with the sender's *bijak*. Payment could not be made straight off on the consignee's statement because bogus claims were often received. He had a case pending from one local station to another in which the claim amounted to Rs. 1,000. It had subsequently been found that the case was a bogus one. The merchant had been prosecuted. When the information given by the merchant was full there was no difficulty. He maintained a register in which the number of cases of public claims was recorded. He and the Deputy Traffic Manager, Claims, occasionally looked in it to see what were the cases outstanding. If a man received something short in Lucknow in a consignment coming from Howrah and he was satisfied of the *bond fide* of his claims he paid it under the Conference Rules without awaiting detailed instructions from the foreign line, leaving the incidence of liability to be settled later on. There were very long delays in correspondence while fixing liabilities for shortages between the railways, but so far as the public was concerned claims were paid within two months on the case of goods booked at railway risk. In the case of consignments booked at owners' risk delay took place. He sometimes paid claims for consignments booked at owners' risk and sometimes did not. There were different kinds of risk notes, e.g., forms A to H. The condition of carriage of the various risk notes were quite different and payment was made in such cases according to the merits of each case. He set up clear receipt as an excuse for not admitting claims in some cases. It was not the practice with delivering officers to take clear receipts and to insist upon them, nor was it the practice on the railway to coerce consignees into giving any receipts beforehand.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumbold, Agent, stated that claims had increased by leaps and bounds recently and the Railway had not been able to keep pace with them. Consequently there had been much delay in disposing of claims. Other railways were in much the same situation. The Claims staff was not adequate for the work. The staff was increased in 1919 by 30 per cent. and in 1920 by another 30 per cent. and yet it did not appear to be large enough. People had become much more exacting in their claims. Where a merchant formerly would have been prepared to say that his loss was a mere trifle, the present-day trader wanted every pie. Claims agencies had cropped up and were partly responsible for the work. He was afraid, the railways were not giving satisfaction as regards the settlement of claims.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated that there was no want of co-operation between different departments of the railway, but there was between different railways in regard to acceptance of liability.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, and Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, agreed there was no want of co-operation between different departments of the Railway.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, stated that, so far as he knew, the system of settling claims between the different departments of the same railway was such as did away with any difficulty and between different railways, the system was controlled by Conference Rules.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, and Rao Sahab G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, stated that there was no want of co-operation.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Green, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that it was not possible to dispose of claims cases as expeditiously as could be wished. The methods followed by merchants were not at all conducive to the prompt settlement of claims. They did not give the Railway sufficient details nor did they submit their claims until 4 or 5 months after they had taken delivery. So far as local consignments were concerned claims were settled more

expeditiously than foreign consignments, the average time taken being between 3 to 4 weeks. The main difficulty was insufficiency of information furnished by merchants. Their letters were never complete. They invariably omitted to give the railway receipt numbers or invoice number. In some cases a copy of the Railway's previous letter had to be sent to them. Their information when received differed sometimes from the correct numbers and particulars with the result that when a reference was made to the station concerned, they were not able to trace the consignment according to the particulars given. As regards enquiries into claims accruing through goods received from other railways, in many instances foreign railways unnecessarily delayed in replying to letters. Such trouble had occurred with the Great Indian Peninsula Railway in the case of a consignment of military stores despatched to Nazirabad Station. He had not found the public were unwilling to come forward and make complaints. On the contrary his experience was that for the last few years, they had been more concerned about their claims and shortages than they had been formerly. They hardly gave the railway time to institute inquiries into cases and demanded prompt settlement of claims with the alternative of a civil suit in Court. At Ahmedabad, Broach and Nadiad the attitude of the public was now entirely changed. They resorted to litigation very quickly.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that there was no want of co-operation between different departments of the same railway. Claims arising upon the Traffic passing over certain other railways took much longer to settle than local railway claims. The public were not greatly affected except in the case of traffic at owner's risk. There were difficulties which arose in regard to claims in connection with traffic passing to the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway from certain junctions with foreign railways. The difficulties were to a great extent eventually removed upon representation and there existed a Tribunal to which reference could be made to settle inter-railway disputes, but the delay in disposing of such cases tended to congest the work in the Claims Office. If claims upon foreign railway traffic could be disposed of with the same proportionate despatch as was done in the case of local railway claims, the Claims Office work would be greatly facilitated.

Mr. Cordon, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that the Railway adopted the method of settling within two months as laid down in rule No. 27 of the Conference Rules. Only one railway had taken exception to the interpretation of that rule by the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway. They said that it did not apply to goods carried at owner's risk where a risk note was held. In those cases they had the power to repudiate in certain events and until the cause of the loss was established, the railway had no power to pay on their behalf. A case was put up by one railway at the last arbitration meeting, and the contention of the other railway was not upheld. Upon that he suggested that as their contention was not upheld by the Arbitration Committee, the latter should authorize the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway to settle after two months if the claim was not repudiated. The suggestion, however, was not agreeable to them. It took the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway two months to dispose of local claims and four months in the case of foreign railway claims.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, and Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, thought that there was no want of co-operation between different departments of the same railway, or between different railways in regard to claims.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that there was much trouble in getting claims settled for which foreign railways were responsible and the receiving railway had to pay. Months elapsed before responsibility was accepted, one railway blaming the other where more than two or three railways were concerned. He had not found that there was any difficulty in working up to rule 28 of the Conference Rules about the statement of claims within two months. If the consignment was booked at railway risk and if he could get no information regarding it after the lapse of two months, he paid the claim. The difficulty lay in recovering the money from foreign railways. He had pointed out to the Traffic Committee in Calcutta that in a period of six months, he had paid claims amounting to about Rs. 8,000 and there seemed little hope of recovering the money for years. He approved of the suggestion made by the Inspector-General of Police, Madras, that there should be a sort of Imperial Railway Detective Police to whom cases of this sort could be handed over. Once such a case was handed over to the Imperial Police, they would be able to carry it on to a finish.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, stated with reference to the Conference rule enforcing payment within two months that in some cases it was possible, but in others enquiries went on for 8 or 9 months in spite of the fact that the object of the rule was that doubtful cases which the Company was not able to repudiate should at once be paid. The difficulty was that in the case of losses over foreign railways, if the South Indian Railway paid up, they had to wait for months and correspond in order to settle who was actually responsible. He admitted that this was not a plea which would be accepted under the rules.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, stated that there was want of co-operation between the different departments of the same railway and between different railways in regard to claims.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, and Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, were not aware of any difficulty.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, was of opinion that there was no want of co-operation between the different departments of the same railway or between different railways in regard to claims.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, and Bala Kalka Prasad, Station Master, all agreed.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

The witnesses stated that there was no want of co-operation, but some railways were very dilatory in replying to references regarding claims.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that when a railway found that it was not responsible for a claim it usually took very little interest in the case thereafter. Local claims were dealt with by the Traffic Department and it was not often that any other department was in a position to co-operate in the matter.

Assam-Bengal Railway.

The witnesses were of opinion that there was no lack of co-operation between the different departments of the same railway. If such existed, it was always possible to rectify matters by seeking the intervention of the Agent, but there was no co-operation between the different railways, the idea being to avoid responsibility of paying a claim at any cost.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager, stated that there was no want of co-operation between the different departments of the railway in regard to claims cases in general. There might be a little friction between subordinates quarrelling over details, but whenever such cases came to notice they were taken up and dealt with. There was a certain amount of difficulty in getting information from other railways in connection with claims which was due to the fact that official correspondence was not promptly dealt with. In the North-Western Railway there was a system of demi-official correspondence under which prompt replies were secured. A number of bad cases had occurred with certain railways.

The other witnesses all answered the question in the negative.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

No.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that he had not experienced any lack of co-operation between different departments or railways in regard to claims. In regard to the relationship between different railways, however, the practice was to close investigation upon proving an entry in the records of transfer of a consignment to the contiguous railway. In consequence of the amount of work to be done within a limited time at the junction of two railways the records were not in all cases accurate and he considered that more attention should be paid to the request from one railway to another for continuance of enquiry after delivery had apparently been proved.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Claims Inspector, stated that as claims between Railways were settled in accordance with Conference Regulations no difficulty was experienced in this respect, but whereas the staff of all departments had access to wagons standing in yards only those of the Traffic Department were subjected to debits for shortages reported.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, was of opinion that there was decided want of co-operation; for example, at a large station the staff of the different departments were moving about the yard at all hours of the day and night and yet thefts were perpetrated which were obviously due to collusion between them and the persons who committed the thefts.

Pundit Amrit Lal Tewari, Station Master, Budann, stated that there was want of co-operation but did not mention instances.

Question 13.—Are you of opinion that the present allocation, strength and working of the police on your railway are satisfactory? In what particulars, if any, are alterations required, in your opinion?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Mr. Harvey, Agent, suggested that the Railway Police should be formed into a Department similar to other Railway Departments with a District Police Officer at the head. This District Police Officer could then report to the Traffic Manager and also to his Deputy Inspector-General.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, brought the following list of defects to the notice of the Committee :—

(1) All ranks are drawn from the Civil Police and are liable to be returned to it. The impression exists that the District Police send their less desirable men to the Railway Police, sometimes as a punishment.

(2) None of the upper subordinates in the Railway Police are trained in the internal working of a railway, which is absolutely necessary if their duties are to be properly performed. This applies to the booking and transit of parcels, goods, etc., as well as to Line Clear working and train running.

(3) Insufficient gazetted officers.

(4) Inspectors are generally promoted from Sergeants and are untrained in railway work.

(5) Sergeants are generally untrained in railway work and without experience.

(6) Sub-Inspectors are not always well educated or sufficiently acquainted with English in which language all railway work is conducted.

(7) Constables are generally illiterate and therefore cannot even read seal labels, which should become part of their duties.

(8) The whole force is seriously undermanned.

(9) The whole force is inadequately paid. They should be given a duty allowance above the pay of the District Police to attract the best men.

(10) In the lower ranks bribery and corruption are almost universal, especially at *melas*.

(11) There are insufficient powers of discipline in the hands of the European Sergeant while the Inspectors are too busy with court work to give sufficient attention to this matter.

(12) Consequently the constables seem to be very slack.

(13) Adequate punishments do not seem to be given to constables who are proved to have committed faults.

(14) There is an atmosphere of superiority and domination in the dealings of the Railway Police with the Railway staff and neither the police subordinates nor their reports are ever admitted to be wrong by their superiors when questioned by the Traffic Department.

(15) This atmosphere is reflected in the fact that there is no hard and fast rule requiring the Inspector or Sub-Inspector to discuss the whole case with a responsible Station Master or Traffic Inspector before prosecuting a railway servant. There is too much prosecution of individuals on suspicion without adequate foundation; and even fabrication of evidence is sometimes suspected. In cases where co-operation between upper subordinates of the Railway Police and Traffic Department exists, excellent results are obtained.

(16) Endeavour is generally made to shift responsibility on to some other Police Division instead of getting to the bottom of the case.

(17) There is no proper Criminal Investigation Department attached to the Railway Police.

(18) There is insufficient co-operation between Railway Police and District Police.

Colonel Anderson suggested the following remedies :—

1. Recruit the best and best educated men—as a separate service from the District Police.

2. Pay them better than the District Police and more on the scale of Traffic Subordinates. Traffic Subordinates start at about Rs. 28 and menials at about Rs. 11. The police constable, and especially the higher grades, should be treated as a superior man to a railway menial and more nearly on a par with the railway subordinate class. These are now all being appointed from the English semi-educated standard, School Leaving Certificate or higher, and for this class of man with a small family, Rs. 40 is about the living wage. They start on less but are raised to about Rs. 40 when they show that they are worth keeping.

3. Put all ranks through a thorough training in railway traffic work of all kinds, additional to police work. This can be done partly on the railway and partly in a training school. The Railway would be glad to give railway training to any number of policemen.

4. Sub-Inspectors must be well educated in English.

5. Constables should be able to read English and should be able to assist travellers who consult them on railway matters ; though these are perhaps rather high ideals.

6. Detective sections should be organized to watch transportation at ports, goods depots and junctions, where the worst pilferages occur. The Railway suffers from the want of a Detective Section. At Delhi especially there are many thefts which are never detected, there being no detectives on this section of the line. Over one-third of the earned freight on piece-goods is paid away on pilfered consignments from Delhi.

7. Members of the Railway Police should not be kept too long at any one station.

8. Minimum police supervision per Railway Traffic District should be :—

1 European Gazetted Officer,

2 European Inspectors,

4 Indian Sub-Inspectors,

on the lines of the Railway Traffic administration.

9. For the superior administration of the Railway Police a Railway Police Inspector-General should be appointed with possibly one or more Deputy Inspectors-General to assist him for all Railway Police work, instead of the present method of administering from provincial headquarters. " Railway police work is of so special a type that specialists are required to deal with it satisfactorily and the ramifications of railway crime extend over such long distances that the present provincial methods of dividing the Railway Police even sometimes on one railway system must necessarily prevent the best results being obtained."

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, thought that the present police force was insufficient, undermanned and underpaid. They did not know railway regulations and the subordinate supervising staff had little or no English education. The system of recruiting was defective and the staff were mostly otherwise incompetent and their methods of enquiry were defective. The percentage of convictions secured was small. He would have a separate cadre of Police for all Indian Railways under the Railway Board to be enrolled from the province and trained in a training school for railway working only. The men should be capable and well-educated. They should be given better pay and travelling allowances. Gazetted officers should be posted to each Traffic District. There should be a Criminal Intelligence Department attached to each railway headquarters. The present system of getting men from the District Police was defective. No one could expect good men from another district or department. The Police should maintain order at stations under the orders of Sub-Inspectors and not under the orders of Station Masters.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, did not consider the allocation, strength or working of the Police satisfactory. The staff was insufficient and Inspectors' charges were too long. The pay was insufficient. He recommended the concentration of force and was opposed to the maintenance of outposts. He had no complaints to make about the lack of cleanness in the definition of the duties of the Railway Police, nor had he experienced any difficulty in getting the Police to undertake general enquiries.

Mr. Walsh, Traffic Inspector, Lucknow, did not think that there were sufficient Police. The deficiency made itself most apparent in patrolling. He thought that at stations like Bara Banki if the yard were patrolled by head constables and one or two men at odd hours during the night to keep the Watch and Ward on the alert much good would result. The only objection was that the Police would probably begin to interfere with the Watch and Ward staff.

Mr. O'Connor, Station Superintendent, Lucknow, said that the Railway Police was undermanned. There were not enough men for patrolling and yard work. The lower ranks did not know how to treat the public. He would have a separate service with a training school. Literate men were wanted and better men than were recruited for the District Police. Higher pay would be necessary to attract better men. He would have a detective staff, *i.e.*, men who would not give themselves away by saluting. Passenger train guards should travel in *mufti*. The staff at his station was inadequate.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Bara Banki, thought that the Railway Police was undermanned. At his station there was practically only 1 constable for the whole yard.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, thought that the strength of the Railway Police was extraordinarily weak. For instance, running train thefts occurred owing to the fact that gangs of robbers boarded trains while passing along the line. The situation at present was serious and apparently beyond the capacity of the present force. When a bad outbreak of thefts occurred in certain localities the Police should be instructed to institute patrols. In exceptional conditions such as now existing between Igatpuri and Nandgaon, it was beyond the scope of any railway company to prevent thefts. All that the Railway could do was to exercise reasonable

precautions such as locking of wagons, seal-checking and running of goods trains during the day where it is possible, instead of at night. The Railway Police at present were not strong enough in numbers for this sort of duty; but he thought it was a part of the duty of the Police to prevent running train thefts as they were responsible for Law and Order.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, considered that sufficient attention was not being paid by the Railway Police to the prevention and investigation of thefts. The force was not flexible enough to deal with abnormal conditions requiring additional staff. The average constable, if he did not, as there was reason to believe was the fact in the case of the railway staff, connive at pilferages, afforded very little protection, and he considered the strengthening of the supervising staff, with special reference to the theft of goods, was essential. The establishment of an adequate detective force was another essential. In regard to the present epidemic of running train thefts, a considerable strengthening of the police force was also necessary.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, was of opinion that it was desirable to improve the general standard of the Police. He did not think the force on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway was up to full establishment. There was want of co-operation between the District Police and the Railway Police. A larger staff was required to cope with the running train thefts which were taking place between Igatpuri and Bhusawal.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, thought that the present allocation, strength and working of the Police was not satisfactory. The strength of the Police was insufficient; more investigating officers were required, and police stations were too far apart. There was one Sub-Inspector at Poona for 115 miles of railway line with 23 stations including Dhond, Poona and Lonavla.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, stated that the allocation appeared to be inadequate. The present working of the Police was restricted solely to attendance on platforms for passenger trains. A staff should be appointed to supervise the watch on goods sheds and to patrol yards, parcel offices, etc.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, stated that the working of the Police was unsatisfactory. Two-thirds of the force that was allotted for a station was usually absent on special duty for fairs, High Officials' specials, or owing to sickness and leave. It frequently happened when Police aid was required that Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors and Sergeants were absent. If a constable was accidentally found he pleaded ignorance as a reason for non-interference. "When, however, a Superintendent of Police arrives, the police force are tripping over one another."

Rao Sahab G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, thought that the allocation, strength and working was satisfactory except in regard to checks on wagon seals on running trains. A Police check of all wagon seals at engine changing stations would help in locating thefts.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Peckey, General Traffic Manager, stated that the allocation, strength and working of the Railway Police could best be judged by the results. On the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway broad gauge system, in 1920 the value of property stolen amounted to Rs. 18 lakhs, while the value of property recovered amounted to only about half a lakh of rupees. He attributed this state of affairs to the ineffectiveness of the Police responsible for the prevention of crime and the maintenance of order due to the following principal reasons, (1) the personnel of the police force, (2) the absence of any detective force, (3) insufficiency of supervision, (4) lack of co-operation on the part of the subordinate police with the railway staff. His remarks on the first four points should be taken as applying more particularly to the Railway Police under the Superintendent of Police, Bombay, as for nearly the whole of his service, his headquarters had been at Bombay and he had had little opportunity of observing the Police on the metre gauge. He believed that the Railway Police on the northern section of the line were much better than those on the southern, as out of the total losses suffered by the Company last year about 18 lakhs occurred on the broad gauge and Rs. 14 lakhs on the metre gauge. There was however not very much difference in the working results of the two force. (1) *Personnel*.—There appeared to be great difficulty in recruiting. In his annual report for 1920 the Superintendent of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway Police, said, "I am finding greater difficulty than ever in recruiting. The type of recruit that offers himself is singularly unattractive in every way. At the close of the year I had 29 vacancies." As regards efficiency, he said "A sword which has been allowed to lie corroding in rust for a long time is not to be converted into an effective weapon by one rub. Neither can the Railway Police who have been taught for years to turn a blind eye to crime and stolidly to ignore its existence be at once converted into an effective detective or preventive force." The Railway Police wanted a very much better class of man than they obtained at present. He did not, however, think that there was very much in the suggestion that a larger proportion of literate men was required in the Railway Police than in the District Police. The provision of good quarters would attract better men to the force. He did not know what the rule was regarding the provision of quarters for the Railway Police on his Railway, but he knew that the Police authorities were endeavouring to provide them with quarters. (2) In the absence of an efficient detective force, no one seemed to know where or by whom the bulk of thefts were committed. Gangs of professional thieves, villagers who were short of food and saw easy

opportunities of getting it, dishonest traders, dishonest clerical railway staff, railway menial staff, Railway Police and Watch and Ward all took part in the thieving, but which of them was the most responsible and how they did it still remained a mystery. The main difficulties were that the Police had not got sufficient men and could not secure enough funds to provide the additional staff that was required for the purposes of investigation. (3) A larger number of officers and well-paid upper subordinates was an obvious need. (4) Co-operation did not exist between the subordinate staff of the Railway Police and the Railway Company. He feared that it was unattainable owing to the views held by Indians generally about the Police and to the views held by the Police about themselves. Between the superior staff of the two departments there was co-operation. Its effectiveness depended largely on the personality of the Superintendent of Railway Police. It had been particularly difficult to make this co-operation effective by means of a continuous policy in Bombay owing to the frequent changes in Superintendents of Police. As remedial measures he suggested that now that thieving had become so rife and so many people had realised how easy it was to steal valuable goods from railways, it was imperative that better protection should be given to railway yards and trains and that all railway wagons should have locks on them. The need for this latter device was brought forward by the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway administration at the last Railway Conference. He would like to see it definitely laid down that the Police were responsible for dealing with all running train thefts and that the Watch and Ward should deal only with the yards as long as the present system of Watch and Ward and Police continued. He was also in favour of having a special training school for the Railway Police, who ought to have a certain amount of railway training, that is, they should know the railway system, such as the working of trains, general management of goods work, etc. He agreed that possibly actual deputation to a railway would achieve better results than training at a school. He did not think that life in the Railway Police was hard although there was a great deal of night work.

Mr. Green, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, felt very strongly that the protection of goods in the goods shed and on running trains should be kept entirely under the Railway Staff. He would not have the Police connected with the protection of goods either on trains or in yards. He would rely entirely on the Watch and Ward. He would leave the Railway Police to deal with crimes on the railways.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that judging solely by the results attained by the Police in investigating and preventing thefts, he did not consider that the Police arrangements were satisfactory. The fact that the Superintendent of Railway Police should have to refer the Railway authorities to the Police Station Inspectors for the results of police investigations would suggest that this important matter was not subject to his personal attention. The Railway felt that the Superintendent ought to know what was actually going on. All that they wanted to know was the result, but to get that information they had to go to the Station Inspector and the Railway felt that they were required to do that because the Superintendent did not acquaint himself sufficiently with such matters. It was a weakness of the police organization that cases of theft should be reported by the Superintendent of Government Railway Police as having occurred "outside my jurisdiction" and no further action taken. (For further remarks see his reply to question 19.)

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, thought that the present allocation, strength and working of the Police were not satisfactory. The present system of Law and Order under the Police and Watch and Ward under the Traffic Department with no liaison between the two Departments did not afford the necessary protection to goods and property. To what extent the Superintendent, Railway Police, had knowledge of cases calling for investigation or being investigated, or of the arrangements made by his staff for the prevention of crime and thefts was not clear. All correspondence in the Bombay Presidency was conducted direct with Sub-Inspectors. That arrangement was satisfactory. It would be absurd to make the Superintendent of the Government Railway Police a post office because it would entail an enormous amount of ordinary routine work and he would not be able to carry out his legitimate functions as a Superintendent of Police, but what was not clear to him was whether the Superintendent of the Government Railway Police had any knowledge of the cases which were reported to each station. For instance, at Waltair two years ago, there were many running train thefts. Rice was being stolen in great quantities and for some time no concerted action could be taken because reports were made to Sub-Inspectors of a dozen different stations from perhaps fifty receiving stations. Had copies of these reports been in possession of one Police Officer the fact that something was radically wrong somewhere would quickly have been apparent. Common excuses adopted by the Police were "outside jurisdiction," "too late" and "short loading." The Police did not help the Railway in detecting cases of theft or in preventing them.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, did not consider that the working of the Police was satisfactory. There was a tendency to shirk under the cloak of the Law by quibbling. More supervision was required. The Police should be under the control of the Railway and punishable by the Railway. Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors should have a knowledge of railway work. Men with detective ability were also required. In nearly every case prosecuted, the culprit had been caught red-handed by someone (usually a railway servant) but often such

cases for want of proper working up had failed in Court. Members of the staff should be punished for neglect of duty. For instance, in the case of a running goods train theft, when there was a serious case, the Railway always punished the guard, but the constables got off scot-free. The Railway at least assumed that there was no punishment and that his name, at the worst, was entered in the black list, because the crime did not cease. He thought that if the Police were placed under the Railway they would do better work and that the crux of the whole matter was that the Railway should be in a position to punish the Police.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, stated that police constables should be changed every six months, otherwise, they got in with the Watch and Ward and instigated offences.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, did not think that the strength was sufficient at all stations. He recommended that each ordinary station should have two constables to work both day and night in turns.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Logan, Agent, considered that trespass on railway land should be made a cognizable offence. Besides being a source of danger to the lives and limbs of those who indulged in this practice, it was a necessary preliminary to a large amount of petty pilfering, both of goods in transit and of carriage fittings. Under the existing state of the law, it was non-cognizable. Such being the case, no assistance could be looked for from the Railway Police either in putting it down or in instituting prosecutions. The figures of killed and injured on the South Indian Railway for the last 5 years had risen from 46 in 1915 to 70 in 1919. He was further of opinion that persons found on railway premises in possession of railway material or fittings and concerning which there was reason for suspicion should in the event of their not being able satisfactorily to account for the same be presumed to have been in unlawful possession and punished accordingly. The extension of the provisions of Section 54, clause 4, sub-clause (1) of the Calcutta Police Act of 1866 would in this connection appear desirable.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that the work of the Police was not entirely satisfactory. A large number of cases were reported as undetected or non-cognizable. Recently a large number of shortages had occurred in station collections and although some of them dated back a year or more, no clue had yet been found to any one of them. Some time ago a cash chest at Mettupalayam containing the whole of the Nilgiri Railway station collections, amounting to over Rs. 4,000 was lost. Although it was reported within half an hour of its occurrence and although a number of men must have been concerned no clue had been found up to date. The Railway even gave the Police the numbers of the stolen notes. The chest was thrown out of the van as the train was leaving Mettupalayam and the loss was discovered at the next station and reported by wire. Much also had been said lately about corruption on the part of the railway staff, such as taking money for wagons, and he felt sure that the Police could help more than they did. Although matters were exaggerated, there was no denying that corruption existed and that the Police must know all about it. The Railway had done a great deal to put down corruption by the appointment of special wagon distributors, highly paid men who had a section of 100 to 200 miles under their charge and the District Traffic Superintendents distributed wagons themselves to all important goods sheds, including the headquarter stations. If the police did their duty, they must hear a great deal and they should let the Railway authorities know what they had heard. The Police entrenched themselves behind the Criminal Procedure Code and limited themselves to a strict discharge of their legal duties. For instance, they might help the Railway in the matter of overcrowding, particularly on the Madras Beach Pallavaram section, where day after day passengers, particularly students, rode on foot-boards and indulged in other dangerous practices without being stopped. He admitted that the Police could not prevent trespass under the existing state of the law, but he thought they could help the Railway authorities by obtaining the names and addresses of offenders. People in India had not got the same sense in regard to trespass as people in England. A walk along the railway line was not allowed there and the rules were more or less respected. Here people promptly availed themselves of short cuts across or along the line. All railway servants were expected to stop trespass, and to a certain extent he thought it was done by the permanent way gangs between stations, but the nuisance was more noticeable in station yards. For instance, at Madura, trespassing took place in all directions. His suggestion was that if the Police were given requisite powers, people would carry out the instructions of the man in uniform more promptly than those of a railway pointsman or other menial. If the Railway went to court for trespass, the Station Master was kept all day long in court, a great deal of time was wasted, the case would be adjourned two or three times, and after all the trespasser might escape. He suggested that trespass should be made a cognizable offence as trespassers might be potential thieves. He was also of opinion that the officer who commenced the investigation of a case should complete it. In cases where the railway staff were found committing or conniving at fraud they were summarily dismissed, whereas it was understood that the Railway Police were by no means so severely dealt with when they were found guilty of similar offences. With reference to the strength of the force it should be increased to admit of constables being drafted to special work such as assistance to the Watch and Ward staff at stations where thefts were frequent and also to admit of line patrols and running train escorts. Members of the latter force should invariably be armed.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, did not consider that the present allocation and strength of the Police on the South Indian Railway were up to requirements. There was

also room for improvement in working. There were no Police at out-stations. The Police should prevent all loiterers and beggars from infesting platforms and goods sheds. They should do much more to regulate vehicle traffic at passenger train times. They should keep an eye on persons acting as agents for the purchase of tickets for 3rd class passengers. They should also take up cases of passengers urinating and committing nuisance in 3rd class sheds and approach roads to stations. Between train times the policemen were not to be found on the premises. "One has to send men all round the country before a constable turns up, and then he is not properly dressed or looks very sleepy."

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, suggested that the Police should form a branch of the railway under the head of the railway administration and that the Watch and Ward should be placed under their control. He would even go a step further and appoint as constables only retired military men not above 40 years of age on a salary sufficient to keep them above temptation. He did not think there were sufficient policemen to watch passenger-waiting sheds or booking offices. Policemen kept away from these places in order to avoid complaints.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, thought that the strength of the Police was insufficient. A certain number of constables should be placed at the disposal of Station Masters at big stations so that their services might be used whenever required, as for instance, to keep order on the platform in addition to the men employed by the Railway.

Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, stated that he could only reply as far as his station was concerned. Firstly the strength was poor, secondly even the few men posted made a hobby of constantly being present in the passenger shed (even when not warranted by the number or nature of passengers) under pretence of assisting in guarding the person and property of passengers. They seldom made their appearance in the goods shed and under present rules Station Masters could not question or criticize their actions.

East Indian Railway.

Mr. Hindley, Agent, stated that while the railway administration had no voice in the strength and distribution of the Crime and Order Section he felt that certain matters should be brought to notice. In the first place there was a feeling that the Police were undermanned and that the Superintendent had little reserve of force for any special work either in investigation or in maintaining order. As the East Indian Railway passed through five provinces and in each province there was a separate division, or district charge, of Railway Police, it was not easy for a railway officer to say in detail how and where the deficiency of force existed, but there always appeared to be some difficulty in applying police action at any individual place promptly owing to inadequacy of available personnel. In addition to increasing the numbers, Superintendents, particularly those in charge of the larger divisions, should be given the services of one or two Assistant Superintendents. For the purpose of detection and investigation one of the most important steps that should be taken was improved methods of seal-checking of wagons. For railway purposes this was one of the duties of the guards on trains and the evidence thus obtained was no doubt useful in many cases in proving that wagons had not been interfered with between certain points. For Police purposes, however, such checking was of little actual value because it was only one of the other duties of the guard and there never was any certainty that his report was made as the result of detailed personal inspection. In fact the time at his disposal was frequently not sufficient. There should, therefore, be an independent seal-checking staff posted at certain definite points along the line of railway for the information of the Police and to enable them to ascertain with certainty on what section or at what stations seals were tampered with. There was considerable want of co-ordination between the work of the Railway Police and the District Police. It was almost inevitable that there should be difficulties of this nature. The Railway Police district in each province traversed a number of civil districts and the Superintendent of Railway Police had therefore to deal with several other Superintendents. The railway itself afforded means to criminals of moving from one district to another and there was no doubt that a feeling existed in the District Police that but for the delinquencies of the Railway Police, crime would not so easily spread from one district to another. This was a matter, however, on which he could not speak with any personal experience and he could only say that there was lack of co-operation and co-ordination in places. This could be remedied by having *liaison* officers working to co-ordinate District Police and Railway Police work and the functions of such officers could be extended to obtaining co-ordination and co-operation also with the Railway Watch and Ward staff and other railway departments concerned with the handling of goods.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that the allocation, strength and working was satisfactory as far as it went, but there should be a separate organization for the detection of crime in the following directions: (i) Detectives in goods sheds, transshipment sheds, parcels offices; (ii) Patrols in yards for the detection and prevention of yard thefts; (iii) Travelling detective patrols for passenger trains to prevent loss of both booked and unbooked property; (iv) Line patrols for the detection and prevention of thefts from running goods trains; (v) the hands of the Police were tied in the matter of arresting persons found with suspicious goods in their possession except at certain places like Howrah for which there was a local Act. It would assist the Police if similar arrangements could be made for places outside Howrah.

The present lengths of the districts of Superintendents of Government Railway Police were too great for the officers to know what was happening in their districts. Their districts should be shortened and they should be given the assistance of one or more Assistant Superintendents so that they could tour their lengths more frequently and come in contact with the provincial officials more than they did at present.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, stated that the present allocation, strength and working were satisfactory but that the lengths of line which the Superintendent and Investigating staff were required to control were far too long and changes were too frequent so far as the supervising staff was concerned. He never saw the Superintendent. He did not blame him as he had too much work. There should be a separate department for investigation similar to the Criminal Investigation Department strong and capable enough of giving the question of theft their whole-time attention.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, did not consider that the working or allocation of the Police were satisfactory. The force was not nearly strong enough, and there was not sufficient supervision by superior officers.

Mr. Harris, Goods Superintendent, Howrah, stated that Police enquiries were very slow.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, stated that the present system was not satisfactory. There should be a special department exclusively devoted to investigating thefts. Claims had increased during the last 5 years owing to the general rise in prices. The Police had so many other enquiries to make, all of a different nature, that they simply could not do their work properly. If they had a special department to take up such enquiries immediately, there would be a greater chance of detecting the culprits and also of recovering the property stolen.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, Mokameh Ghat, did not consider that the present allocation, strength and working of the Police were satisfactory. The district for one superior officer was too long and he could not devote sufficient personal interest to every case in his district, with the consequence that enquiry work was entrusted to petty officers. It was very difficult to get a prosecution. If he arrested a man taking away 5 seers of rice, he had to prove from where that man had obtained the rice; he had to search all the goods sheds to find out the bag from which the rice was stolen, and after a month or so when the case came up to court he had to swear that that was the very same bag he saw. In Howrah the rule was that if a man was found to possess certain articles in suspicious circumstances he had to prove from where he obtained them.

Babu Kalka Prasad, Station Master, stated that the allocation and strength of the Police Department was sufficient but that the working was unsatisfactory inasmuch as the Police ignored the Railway. The Police should be brought under the direct supervision and control of the Agent. In that case the chowkidars and constables would be equally responsible if anything went wrong. At present the Police were not responsible for anything.

Bengal-Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, stated that the defects in the organization of the Railway Police were—(1) want of co-operation between various divisions of the Railway Police and the desire, whenever possible, to shift responsibility on to the Railway Police of another province. As an instance, he mentioned a consignment going through from Calcutta to Nagpur. At Sambalpur it passed out of the hands of the Bihar and Orissa Police into those of the Central Provinces Police. If anything went wrong the Central Provinces Police said that it happened before their jurisdiction and the Bihar and Orissa Police said that they had nothing to do with it as it was not within their jurisdiction. There was no means of bringing the two police forces together. (2) The inferior personnel of the subordinate Police force. He knew of many cases where dismissed railway guards had been taken on as Inspectors of Police in the Central Provinces and immediately put to work at a railway station.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Coates, Agent, thought that more Sub-Inspectors were required specially at important junctions and ghat stations such as Naihati and Goalundo.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, was of opinion that the present allocation and strength of the Police was satisfactory for the functions they had to perform. The strength would have to be increased if the Police undertook the duties of the Watch and Ward. He thought that as regards working the Police might place a more liberal interpretation on the words "reasonable ground of suspicion" before registering a case. As an instance, he cited the case of an attempt on the part of a jemadar of a firm to pass off a consignment belonging to another merchant as his. He pointed out the consignment as his and had it loaded in his name. Meanwhile the loading was delayed, the real owner came and asked for his bundle. All loading was stopped. The European Goods Supervisor was sent for and he checked the wagons and found out the consignment. A complaint was lodged against the jemadar and the reply of the Police was "This is not a case for the Police; you must give me a definite charge" thus putting the onus of making a definite charge on the railway staff. Mr. Gilmore also stated that he had asked every Superintendent of Police to give him a few detectives and he would appoint them as watchmen at places where such were wanted, such as Santahar and Naihati. Other detectives could be trained as tally clerks. This force would be of great assistance in cases where goods were misdespatched at important transshipment

yards, in which the difficult question of location arose. Regarding police enquiries he stated that if the Railway dealt with cases as the Police did he did not know what would happen. Railway officials sent very important cases to the Police; they were forwarded on to the Sub-Inspector who sent up a report for the information of the Traffic Manager; but there never appeared to be any supervision by officers. In his work he would not be satisfied with reports from men of that kind. He would want a District Traffic Superintendent or an Assistant District Traffic Superintendent to look into the matter and submit his own remarks, but in the Police the authorities seemed to be quite satisfied with the Sub-Inspector's report. Regarding seal-checking the Police relied upon rule 75 of Police Regulations, Bengal, Volume VI, and also quoted paragraph 183 of the Report of the Indian Police Commission as their authority for not undertaking the duty of seal-checking.

Mr. Meakins, District Traffic Superintendent, said he was not in a position to answer the question but he thought that the department was understaffed.

Mr. Gundry, Electrical Engineer, thought that a more intelligent class of man was required. Trained and reliable men should be drafted to different stations at frequent intervals to prevent connivance. They should travel on trains, should be allowed to sleep in them and occupy them at all times especially at outstations at night.

Mr. Minahan, Transportation Inspector, was of opinion that the Police at large stations should be under the Station Superintendent or Station Master.

Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, Serajgunj, said that more police officers were required in order to make prompt enquiries into cases reported.

Assam Bengal Railway.

Mr. Nolan, Acting Agent, mentioned that the views of Mr. Bayley, the Agent, were that the services rendered by the Railway Police to the Railway Administration were not commensurate with the expenditure involved. In his opinion the main causes of dissatisfaction were:—(1) Lack of interest by the Inspector-General of Police. (2) Posting of Superintendents, Inspectors and other subordinate Railway Police officers to railways who were in many cases unsuitable and incompetent, and in these cases, the railway had no redress. (3) Failure of the Railway Police staff to trace offenders in cases of stone-throwing and obstruction on the line. (4) The failure to detect railway theft cases and failure generally in controlling the public on the station platform. (5) Trouble arising out of friction between the Railway staff and the Police staff, the latter at times harassing the Railway staff and behaving in an overbearing manner, with the obvious result that the Railway staff retaliated when possible. (6) The bad feeling occasionally created by the Railway Police unwisely instituting prosecutions against the Railway staff.

Mr. Nolan did not think that the subordinate officers and the rank and file of the Police allotted to this Railway were at all satisfactory, nor was this to be expected with the present system under which the men were drawn from the Provincial Police. The Railway received little help in cases of stone throwing which were common when a new line was opened. The Police did not detect theft or keep order on platforms.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, did not think that the work of the Railway Police as at present constituted could be described as satisfactory. Railways were made the dumping ground for inefficient and incompetent subordinate officers. The so-called investigating centres ought to be abolished and the Police staff of the lower grades distributed to large and important stations for the purpose of maintaining order on the platform, and in the case of crime, recording first informations, which could be transmitted by wire, if necessary, to the Superintendent of Railway Police, who should have at his disposal a strong staff of Criminal Investigation Department officers for the purpose of investigation. The Police were very slow in getting to work in a recent epidemic of running train thefts. At last they got Military Police and then armed the Police. The District Police were always dilatory in helping the Railway Police who in spite of having jurisdiction in neighbouring District Police Stations knew little of the public.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, agreed with Mr. Cooper and remarked that the Police were inadequate, unqualified and unsatisfactory generally. There was a want of knowledge of local residents on the part of the Railway Police. The local Police were not co-operative enough and valuable time was lost.

Mr. Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Commercial, also agreed and stated that the present method of investigation was decidedly unsatisfactory, papers being sent from one centre to another for completion and enquiry slips being sent to the local Police. Much valuable time was thus lost and few investigations were brought to a successful finish.

Mr. Janes, Supervising Station Master, Chandpur, considered that the strength was inadequate.

Babu M. Ghosh, Station Master, Gauhati, mentioned that it was efficiency and not numbers, which was wanting.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, stated that he was inclined to suspect that the Railway Police were under-staffed as regards their inspecting officers, as

several cases that the Railway wanted to be enquired into jointly by Commercial Inspectors and Railway Police Inspectors had been considerably delayed apparently owing to the fact that the Railway Police Inspector was too busy to take up the cases at once. There appeared to be a lack of gazetted officers and he could not recollect any theft cases, however serious, being investigated by a police officer above the rank of Inspector. One of his Assistants had informed him that on his joint enquiries with the Police the latter were represented by a Sub-Inspector the case not being considered sufficiently important for even an Inspector. If the present system continued there ought to be an Assistant Railway Police Officer who should devote himself entirely to railway theft cases.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, considered that there was ample room for improvement in the working of the Police on the North-Western Railway. The force required to be strengthened and better supervised. A more efficient system of investigation than at present existed was also desirable.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, did not think that the Police were sufficient in numbers. The force required strengthening and wholesome competition should be bred between Sub-Inspectors by giving special promotion to those men in whose sections no thefts were reported to have occurred. The length of line in charge of each Sub-Inspector should be shortened.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, Karachi, stated that the Sind Railway Police force was very much under strength. The superior staff consisted of one Superintendent and two Inspectors and for the Port Area 1 Sergeant and 1 Sub-Inspector. In his opinion this number was no check against crime being committed. For the Port Area alone the following additional officers appeared to be absolutely necessary:—1 Assistant Superintendent, 2 Investigating Officers, 1 Inspector (Headquarters), 4 Sub-Inspectors, 1 Sergeant at Karachi City. For the Line, 1 Sub-Divisional Officer (Assistant Superintendent of Police) at Sukkur; 1 Sub-Divisional Officer (Assistant Superintendent of Police) at Kotri; 1 Deputy Superintendent at Mirpur Khas; 1 Inspector at Kotri; 1 Inspector at Rohri; 1 Inspector at Sukkur; 1 Sub-Inspector at Jungshahi; 1 Sub-Inspector at Jacobabad; 4 Sergeants at Hyderabad, Rohri, Rukh and Jacobabad. There was plenty of scope for detectives in the Port Area.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, did not consider the strength of the Police at Lahore sufficient. The area to be manned and supervised was much larger than the present staff could possibly deal with efficiently. The checking of seals of wagons arriving was not very efficiently done nor were the Police sergeants on duty at one time actually able to watch attempts at crime. Delays had occurred in getting the Police to witness the opening of wagons with broken or defective seals and this duty was too often left to ordinary constables. An efficient staff of sub-inspectors or European sergeants to witness the opening of any such wagons and vans should be provided.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, stated that the working of the Police on the North-Western Railway was anything but satisfactory. Some Sub-Inspectors holding charge of *thanas* were not up to the mark required of their position. Attendance of the Police at stations was most unsatisfactory. Station Masters did not receive the help required from the Police at the time of fairs and on other occasions when there was a rush of passengers. The Railway Police did not prevent the public or passengers from trespassing into busy yards but declared that it was no part of their duty to interfere in such matters. The help rendered by the Police in discovering and recovering railway stolen property and goods in charge of the Railway Traffic Department could best be judged from the records which would show that a large number of thefts remained untraced. He suggested that the Police should be amalgamated with the Traffic Department and controlled by the Traffic Manager and the Agent in the same way as the Railway Telegraph Department was managed or that it should be placed directly under the control of the Agent in the same way as other Departments such as Loco, Traffic, Carriage and Engineering Departments. Such an arrangement would achieve the desired co-operation between the Traffic and Police employees.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, referring to the working of the Railway Police stated that the fact that imperialization had been suggested was sufficient indication of the need for radical change in the present system. What a revised system must provide for was the establishment of a force to be judged by other standards than the number of convictions secured. A railway officer was constantly faced with questions of a general nature in which a Police enquiry was of the utmost necessity and it would be a great gain if the Railway could count on having assistance rendered promptly and intelligently. For this purpose at least it was necessary that a number of police officers should be set aside to specialize on railway problems. There was little doubt that railway theft was becoming less a matter of casual endeavour and that unscrupulous merchants set themselves to recoup their real or imaginary losses at the expense of a railway's compensation account by the manipulation of their *bijuks*. Were merchants faced with the possibility of a thorough police investigation it was practically certain that many of them would cease to regard the compensation account as fair game and that the running train thief would have it much less his own way. Owing to the heavy running train thefts that had been occurring in the vicinity of Mankapur it had been found necessary to stop the running of goods trains over that section at night. The matter seemed one for extra efforts on the part of both the Railway and the District Police.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, was of opinion that the force was sufficient, but was unequally divided. There was one very bad case which he wished to quote. Fraud had been committed—there was no doubt about its being a criminal case—and it took about five months to get the Police to move in it. False *bijuks* were being submitted and systematic swindling was going on in connection with piece-goods and other consignments from Muzaffarpur to various stations. One particular consignment was booked to one of the Patna stations. The Railway addressed the Assistant Superintendent of Police, Samastipur, giving him the full facts and he referred to the Sub-Inspector, Muzaffarpur, who, however, returned the case saying that the fraud had not taken place within his jurisdiction. The Sonapur Inspector was then referred to but he also refused to take up the case, saying that it was one for the Patna Police, and so on from one to another until after 4 or 5 months it was sent to the Deputy Inspector-General but it was then too late to accomplish anything. This had not been the only case of the kind but it was the most glaring. It was noteworthy that this consignment was carried only 60 miles from Muzaffarpur to Patna and yet all the delay took place due to disputes as to jurisdiction amongst a number of Police Officials.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, Gorakhpur, and Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, thought that the strength of the Police was insufficient.

Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra, thought that the present allocation strength and working of the Police was unsatisfactory. Constables were not intelligent and were an object of fear to the travelling public and the railway staff. He thought that educated men with training in the work which they had to perform were essential and they should be recruited on higher pay than was at present given.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, considered that the allocation of Railway Police *thanas* was satisfactory but he understood that difficulty was at times experienced owing to shortage of men. The reserve was, he believed, 10 constables only which was said to be insufficient to provide reliefs for absentees on account of leave or sickness. This reserve did not provide for men detailed for special duties at out-stations. More attention might be paid to the detection of defective seals and to the location of thefts perpetrated by persons expert in the manipulation of seals.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Claims Inspector, did not consider that the allocation, strength and working of the Police was satisfactory. Transshipment stations should have a constable on duty continually throughout working hours. It was significant that even where Police were quartered they could not be found when wanted for prompt checking of wagons because they were away on *mela* or escort duty.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, thought that the allocation, strength and working were far from satisfactory due to a paucity of constables who, apart from doing duty at their respective stations were ordered out on various other duties which should not be the case. A fixed number of constables should be deputed for night duty at each station to keep watch over loaded wagons and goods vans along with the Traffic Watch and Ward staff and they should be held jointly responsible in the event of robberies being committed because according to present arrangements when thefts occurred the Railway Police maintained that they did perform their duty and went unscathed while the Traffic staff had to bear the brunt in all respects.

Question 14.—Is there any want of co-operation between the members of the railway staff and the railway police, and are you aware of any ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, stated that there was always the danger of an outburst. The two departments naturally pulled different ways and much depended on the tact of Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors. It was recognized by the superior officers of the Police Administration that the Station Master was the senior representative of railway authority at a station and that a certain amount of respect had to be paid to him by the Railway Police. Much tact was required on both sides. Occasionally Sub-Inspectors were not averse from letting Station Masters feel their power.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that there were instances of lack of co-operation.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, stated that lack of co-operation was not heard of as a rule except when the parties fell out about their share. If they combined nothing was heard of at all, but if one party declined to join in the combine then there was trouble. There was no difficulty in getting the Railway Police to undertake general enquiries.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Bara Banki, stated that there was always a certain amount of friction but there was no such trouble with him because he was a first-class Station Master. The Sub-Inspector, Bara Banki, knew that he was superior to him in grade and rank; but there was always a certain amount of friction in stations where there were lower grade station masters, and he thought that this state of affairs would always continue.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, stated that the relations between Railway and Police officers had been very satisfactory. He only remembered one case on the Midland Section where he had had some friction with the Police authorities. The difficulty was that there were constant changes in the superior staff. No sooner a man began to know the line and to get acquainted with the officers, than he was taken away. The practice had become so bad that the Railway Company had had to register a protest to Government. With regard to subordinates, he thought that there was a certain amount of friction.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated that there was no evidence of ill-feeling existing, but that there was undoubtedly want of co-operation.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, did not think that there was cordial co-operation between the members of the railway staff and the railway police, nor that there was friendly feeling between the subordinates of the two departments.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, thought that the railway staff were afraid of the police.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, stated that, so far as his experience went, there was no want of co-operation and no ill-feeling.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, thought that want of co-operation between the railway police and railway staff was the cause of crime on railways. The Superintendents, Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors seldom, or never, came near the Station Master. If the Superintendent on his visit approached or sent for a station master and had a five minutes' conversation, he would gain some information. As it was, he simply heard the tales of his staff.

Rao Saheb G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, thought that there was no want of co-operation and no ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments.

Bombay Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Pechey, General Traffic Manager, was of opinion that there was no such thing among the lower ranks and that the crux of the matter was that the two departments had not the same interests. The interests of the Railway Police were the detection and of the Watch and Ward the prevention of crime. The two could not be co-ordinated under the existing circumstances of the law of cognizance as it stood. Co-operation between the superior members of the two staffs really depended on the personality of the Railway Superintendent of Police. Frequent changes of Superintendents affected co-operation; superior officers should be posted to the railway permanently.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that as an Inspector and District Traffic Superintendent he had frequently experienced considerable want of co-operation on the part of the Police and at times open hostility to bring home a theft to the accused. There had, however, been some measure of improvement in recent years.

Mr. Green, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that the Police did not help the railway to any appreciable extent. Station Masters were expected to give them all sorts of information. There were cases in which the station masters found it difficult to satisfy the requirements of the Police, the result being that no enquiry was instituted in cases in which the Police should have taken action and cases remained untraced. It would be more advantageous if the Police took action immediately on receipt of reports. There was decidedly a lack of feeling on the part of the Railway Police. He could not give the reason as he had never had experience of District work, but he supposed the amount of fruitless investigations was very much greater in the Railway Police than in the District Police and that the District Police did not give sufficient assistance to the Railway Police in tracing their thefts. Most of the offences were committed by residents of villages located within the jurisdiction of the District Police. If the District Police looked after their men better, there would be a smaller number of offences.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, stated that there was practically no co-operation. The position was rather an awkward one. The station master was in charge of the whole establishment at a station and held a very responsible post. The Police jamadar who was perhaps in charge of the outpost considered himself to be superior and would not even consult the station master or do what the latter advised him to do. For instance, if a train were held up at night at the signals and the station master informed the policeman on the platform that the train was held up and was not likely to be received in the yard for about an hour, he should instruct his men to protect the train. Further, in many cases trains arrived with their wagon doors open, clearly showing the certainty of theft. The policeman, however, said that he had been given orders not to leave the station unless a written complaint was given by the station master. In cases of this sort the Watch and Ward could not take up the work as they had to watch the places where they were posted, i.e., sealed wagons lying in yards, packages lying in goods sheds and on open platforms, etc.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that it was felt in the Claims Branch that the Superintendent of Railway Police did not sufficiently co-operate with the Railway.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, did not think that there was any want of co-operation between members of the Traffic Department and the Railway Police, and was not aware of any ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, agreed.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, stated that as a general rule, there was co-operation. He had come across instances of ill-feeling among the constables and station masters and menials, and there were instances where the Police gave very little help in keeping trespassers off platforms and yards. A great deal depended upon the personality of the Sub-Inspector.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, stated that want of co-operation was invariably the case. With a few exceptions the subordinate staff of the Police Department if they could not get what they wanted from the railway staff, trumped up charges against them. This naturally caused a lot of unpleasantness. To avoid this, the Traffic staff preferred to comply with their requests and of course helped themselves to a certain portion also.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Logan, Agent, stated that speaking generally there was no want of co-operation, but there had been one or two cases when the arrest of a railway servant had led to a temporary stoppage of work among his confreres. Such an instance took place not long ago at Podanur on the broad gauge. There was, however, a feeling that the powers of the Railway Police were in many instances so limited as materially to discount their value, *e.g.*, in the case of trespass on railway premises generally, but more especially in stations and goodsyards.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that before the present Superintendent of the Railway Police gave orders to the contrary, the Railway Police were supposed to help in keeping order round booking office windows, but they were accused by the staff of purchasing tickets which they sold at a profit, and so were forbidden from going near the booking office. Then again at certain stations, Podanur for instance, the Railway Police staff and the Traffic staff appeared to be very much at loggerheads, which had resulted in the Traffic menials striking work on two or three occasions. In one instance one of the transshipping porters was arrested by the Police who said that he had been caught stealing red-handed.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, stated that no statistics were maintained, but he did not think that there was any marked want of co-operation. The matter depended upon the personality of the Superintendent of Railway Police.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, thought that the Police were not quite as energetic as they might be in helping the railway staff, but there was no real ill-feeling.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, was not aware of any co-operation.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, stated that there was want of co-operation and ill-feeling. The latter could not be explained, but the fact remained that it did exist.

Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, stated that there was want of co-operation, but at the same time he was not aware of any ill-feeling.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that there was no want of co-operation between the railway staff and the police nor was he aware of any general ill-feeling between the staffs of the two departments. There had been a few instances in which the constables owing to their being fellow villagers or relatives or friends had joined in the quarrels among the menial staff.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, stated that there was decided lack of co-operation between the railway and police staff and several cases of ill-feeling had come to his notice. He was not prepared to say that it was possible to prevent this ill-feeling in the case of the subordinate staff. There had been instances of delay in giving open delivery. "It is a matter I always insist on being done promptly, not so much for the sake of the Police as they will always say that the property is unidentifiable, but in order to prevent the claim growing. We have to work on *bazar* profits and take interest also into account." The delays were due to the fact that Inspectors were very busy men. He had known of a case of a fortnight's delay. The staff of Traffic Inspectors and Assistant Traffic Inspectors had recently been increased. Senior European Station Masters had been empowered to give open delivery.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, stated that the question was a personal one. He had received assistance from certain Superintendents of Police on the one hand and on the other had received practically none at all from others. Where assistance was rendered he had found Police Officers ready to co-operate and take a broad view of the situation and prepared to admit that it took two to make a quarrel. On the other hand he had generally found that where matters were left to deputies, they had only one idea which was that the Police were right and every body else wrong.

In regard to the subordinate staff the bulk of the clerical staff on the line particularly at roadside stations stood in absolute fear of the Sub-Inspector. The reason was obscure but there was no question that this was the case. If the staff were in fear of the Sub-Inspector there could be no co-operation, nor could there be any good feeling. The Police seemed exceedingly foolish at times and did not appear to be able to judge relative values correctly. For instance, at a certain large station, on account of the prevalence of petty thefts, the Police made searches of the whole shunting staff quarters, both inside and outside the railway premises, with the result that the staff went on strike, no information having previously been conveyed to the District Officer. He did not wish to interfere with the Police who had the right to make searches where necessary but at the same time there was such a thing as relative value. To bring about a strike by searches in the houses of the staff working in the yard and to bring the work of a big yard to a standstill did infinitely more harm than a certain amount of petty thefts. There had been more than one case of that kind. The attitude of the Railway was not that they did not want to help the Police in stopping thefts. The instance mentioned above happened during war time and the Railway could not afford to bring a whole section of the line to a standstill because the Police wanted to find out the culprits of the thefts. That could have been got over by making a notification to the Railway Officer in charge, but to act in that way and to send out the whole staff on strike without a word to the Railway Officers on the spot was want of co-operation. Speaking generally, the Police did not render that assistance to the Railway to which it was entitled, bearing in mind that the Railway paid half the cost of the Police. The Police ordinarily existed not only for the prevention and detection of thefts, but for the upholding of Law and Order. Under the head of Law and Order were included such matters as the regulation of vehicular traffic in station compounds, the prevention of passengers and the public from using ways to which they were not entitled, trespass in Railway yards, and in all these matters comparatively no assistance was received from the Police at all. The Railways desired the Police to prevent people from going to places where they ought not to go. A constable could easily prevent men going into railway premises. Railway Officials might order that a particular thing should be done but there was nobody to enforce the order. A ticket collector might be deputed to this duty for instance, but by himself he could do practically nothing. He would have to prosecute and take action against half the population of the town. Take for instance Allahabad, where there were two over-bridges, one intended for the use of passengers and the other for the public. The one for passengers was used by an endless crowd of people passing from one end of the city to the other. When Police assistance was asked for in putting a stop to this state of affairs, the Police asked for a charge-sheet to prosecute half the population. In this instance not only could the ticket collector do nothing but the Railway would have to prosecute people without end and the whole staff would have to attend court for days. The Magistrate would very soon object to the greater part of his time being taken up by hundreds of railway prosecutions in a day. It was just the same in the case of trespass in the yards. Another point of view of the railway administration was, "if you prevent trespass you prevent thefts." One thing re-acted on the other. If the police would not assist in preventing trespass and asked for charge-sheets, thefts could not be reduced.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, stated that there was some lack of co-operation and there had been cases of ill-feeling. Lack of co-operation manifested itself in the harassment that was given to the staff, especially if a case had to go to Court. A man might be required to travel for days and nights and perhaps have to walk long distances and to go without food. After all this trouble the Court would adjourn the case for another year or so, and ultimately information would be received that the Court had decided the case against the Railway. He was referring to civil claims for which the Police were not actually responsible except that they took a statement at the time of a theft and at the same time a claim was preferred against the Railway Company.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, stated that ill-feeling and want of co-operation depended a great deal on how matters were adjusted between the Police and the Traffic Department.

Babu Kaika Prasad, Station Master, stated that there was no want of co-operation on the side of the railway staff but the Police were not willing to co-operate as they had the executive power through which they kept the railway staff in subjection and they wanted the railway staff to give evidence according to their dictates against the truth. If this was not done, the railway staff were put into trouble which was the chief cause of ill-feeling. As far as he knew, the railway staff always tried to help the Police and as a matter of fact unless the railway staff did render them every assistance the Police could do nothing. There were cases in which the Police actually coerced the railway staff into committing thefts. The Police said that if the railway people did not comply with their demands they would be put to a lot of trouble.

Bengal Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, thought that a great deal depended on personality. The relationship between the Railway and the Police was, as far as the Bengal Nagpur Railway was concerned, of the very best. The man who insisted on this was Sir T. R. Wynne. This co-operation was effected through participating with the Police in their games and social life. Senior Railway Officers paved the way, and the subordinates took the cue from them. The

Railway had always been able to obtain the assistance of the Police in everything, and that being so, the claims paid were very low.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Coates, Agent, stated that there was not much co-operation between the railway staff and the railway police. If action were taken by the police against an employee of a railway department the latter was usually backed up by his fellow workers.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, agreed with *Mr. Coates*.

Mr. Meakins, District Traffic Superintendent, was not aware of any of the railway staff having good feelings towards the police. This lack of feeling however was a boon as far as the public was concerned because it led each party to watch the other and thus corrupt practices were prevented to a certain extent.

Mr. Minahan, Transportation Inspector, and *Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, Serajganj*, said that there was no co-operation.

Mr. Dench, Station Master, Santahar, was not aware of any want of co-operation or ill-feeling.

Assam Bengal Railway.

Mr. Nolan, Agent, agreed that it was inevitable that there should be friction between the Railway and police officers, when it was remembered that the majority of pilferages on the railway was due to the act or connivance of the railway staff and that it was the duty of the police to check such pilferages and thefts. He, however, cited a recent case in which a station master on the line received Rs 300 from a merchant, which he did not put into the cash chest at once but went away to take his meal, imagining that he had done so. On his return, he opened the chest, but could not find the money so at once wired to the police and lodged information of theft. Before the arrival of the police, he found that he had placed the money in another drawer. A dismissed pointsman had a grievance against the station master, who suspected the man, and forbade him to leave the station, until the police came. On their arrival the police found that there was no case. The pointsman then won over the police to his side, with the result that a case was instituted against the station master and some others, and the station master was taken away by the police by the next train. The whole case was dismissed in court, but the station master was put to some expense in defending the case. The whole trouble arose from the fact that in a moment of fright the station master called in the police, who finding that there was nothing for them, made up this case. In this instance there was also some family connection between the pointsman and the Police.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that there was great want of co-operation between the railway staff and the railway police which was due to the ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, *Mr. Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims*, and *Mr. Janes, Supervising Station Master, Chandpur*, agreed with *Mr. Cooper*.

Babu M. Ghosh, Station Master, thought that the want of co-operation was due to the overbearing attitude and want of tact on the part of the police. He mentioned an incident of a serious disturbance at a station when a Gurkha soldier got drunk, took his kukri and was about to assault passengers on the station. One of the railway staff went to the constables and asked them to prevent the Gurkha from doing any mischief, but they did not come. They were moreover useless as they had no arms. Meanwhile, two armed policemen got down from the train and arrested the Gurkha. He was of opinion that the Police should be armed. Even when there was over-crowding the police did not like to come and help passengers unless they were specially called for.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Hadow, Agent, thought that co-operation was at a discount in most cases. Policemen were over-worked. They would not take on anything that gave them more work. He doubted whether the Claims investigating staff worked closely with the Police staff. They were rather on a different organization.

Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager, stated that there was no want of co-operation between the railway staff and the police as a rule. The railway staff had from time to time complained of the police not taking up cases. Whenever there was sufficient evidence to show want of co-operation or inattention this was reported to the superior officer and the matter was put right. As a rule, there was not much ill-feeling between the railway staff and the police though the staff avoided quarrelling or having disputes with the police as a matter of principle.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, did not think that there was enough co-operation between the railway staff and the railway police. He never saw a gazetted railway police officer. Inspectors or Sub-Inspectors occasionally came to him on behalf of Superintendents. The railway staff mistrusted the police and some of the senior subordinates considered the police were generally implicated in railway thefts and intimidated the railway staff. Personally, he was not aware of any ill-feeling between the railway police and the railway staff in his district.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims stated that there was want of co-operation but he was not aware of any actual ill-feeling.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, stated that he had found no cases of ill-feeling between the Police and railway subordinates, but if Police Inspectors and Traffic Inspectors worked together for the good of the railway any want of co-operation which might exist between station masters, sub-inspectors and head constables, etc., immediately ceased. The matter was a question of individuality.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, Karachi, stated that instances of want of co-operation and ill-feeling between the railway staff and police had come to his notice.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, stated that he was not aware of any active ill-feeling existing between the railway staff and the police staff, and as far as he knew, the two departments had been able to co-operate efficiently. He knew that his Watch and Ward staff were in very close touch with the police.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, stated that there was much want of co-operation between the members of the railway staff and the railway police. Ill-feeling existed, but was generally suppressed by the railway staff for fear of being further troubled by the railway police.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Superintendent, stated that want of co-operation had generally been noticeable in Bihar and Orissa. The matter was entirely a question of personality. The Railway Police in the United Provinces were ready to help in every way they possibly could. He was of opinion that the Railway Police office and the Traffic Superintendent's office should be under the same roof or as close to each other as possible. Such an arrangement would save a good deal of unnecessary work, as a policeman wanting certain information would only have to go to the District Traffic Superintendent's office and ask for it.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, stated that there was a distinct want of co-operation between the Railway Police and the Railway Administration in the province of Bihar and Orissa. It was less noticeable in the United Provinces.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, Gorakhpur, thought that the co-operation of the Bihar and Orissa Police was not so effective as that of the United Provinces Police. He was not aware of any ill-feeling between the subordinates of the two departments.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, stated that he had heard of several cases where there had been want of co-operation between the police and the railway staff and consequently there had been a great deal of friction between the two departments.

Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra, stated that there was no co-operation when matters of public interest were concerned, each department being jealous and afraid of the other. The police also tried to impress the railway staff with the fact that they were superior and would not be dictated to even if the advice was of benefit to them, thinking it derogatory to receive instructions from men whom they always regarded more as their subordinates than as their colleagues.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that there was occasional want of co-operation between members of the railway staff and the railway police, but his experience had been that such situations could be quickly terminated by frank discussions between the police officers and railway traffic officers concerned.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Claims Inspector, stated that there was considerable want of co-operation.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, stated that strained relations existed, but the why or wherefore was difficult to explain.

Pundit Amrit Lal Tewari, Station Master, Budaun, stated that there was want of co-operation, but there was no ill-feeling at his station.

Question 15.—*Is any more effective system of liaison possible, e. g., by deputing railway officers to the railway police and police officers to the railway temporarily, or by the employment of police officers in the Claims Branch of the Traffic Department?*

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Mr. Harvey, Agent, thought that better co-operation between the police and the railway would be obtained if the police were organized as a department of the railway itself, as suggested in his reply to question 13. He believed he was right in saying that when a police officer at present was put on to railway work he came to the railway without knowing anything about it. Before he took up his duties it would be useful for him to work

in the Traffic Department. In fact he would suggest that he should be put in charge of a small section so that he could come into touch with the ordinary routine work which took place. He should understand the organization of the different departments, difficulties in regard to trains when they were held up at various places and should learn the way in which trains and goods were dealt with.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, did not see the necessity for training the railway traffic staff in police duties though the railway might be glad to have an occasional man trained in Court Inspector's duties. He saw no advantage in training police officers in the Railway Claims Branch, or in their permanent deputation there, as his railway had Indian Claims Inspectors on Rs. 160 to Rs. 180 a month who had long experience in running through merchants' books and generally investigating claims, and the railway had a very competent District Traffic Superintendent on claims work who had trained himself to do a great deal of court work. It would be most unwise to attach an arm of the law to the Railway Claims Office for use in the preliminary stage of an enquiry. The railway should stand alone in this matter till it had strong enough suspicion that some illegality had been committed and till then the power of the police should not be invoked. Claims Inspectors became with experience detectives themselves.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, thought that it would help police officers to learn claims, line clear and other railway work, which would assist them in cases of enquiry into claims cases, accidents, etc., but there would be no advantage for Traffic officers to learn police duties. He did not think it would be advisable to depute police officers permanently to the Claims Branch. People were afraid of giving information to police officers. He had trained his inspectors to make investigations into claims cases and they were quite competent in this direction. In fact they furnished him with more useful information for this purpose than the police.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, did not approve of the suggestion to employ police officers in the Claims Branch because they would take so long to gain a knowledge of railway work. He would, however, give Claims Inspectors training in police work.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, did not think that with a view to improving the feeling between the subordinate ranks that a system of mutual deputation would be possible as the work of the two forces was absolutely different. It might be advantageous to depute an Assistant Superintendent of Police to the Traffic Department to enable him to get a knowledge of railway work. He should be placed under a Traffic Superintendent. It was essential for police officers to have a knowledge of the rules of working of the railway. If he did not possess such a knowledge, he was likely to be found deficient in Court.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, did not consider that the proposal would have any effective results. The police could acquire a complete knowledge of the methods in force for handling goods traffic in a few days, and all the information at the disposal of the railway was available for the police.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, did not think that it would be advisable to transfer railway officers to the railway police and *vice versa*.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, thought that much good could be achieved if railway police and traffic officers had their offices in the same building which would ensure that reports and investigations were made with the minimum delay.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, was of opinion that there would be no advantage in appointing a railway officer to the railway police but there appeared to be one advantage in appointing a police officer in the Claims Branch, inasmuch as investigations into theft cases would be expedited.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, did not think that an effective system could be established as suggested. What was wanted was a co-operative Police Department which would work with the railway staff, especially with the station master in charge. Co-operation did not exist at present.

Rao Saheb G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, did not think that any more effective system of *liaison* was possible.

Bombay Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Pechey, General Traffic Manager, thought that the railway police should have a certain amount of railway training. They should know the railway system such as the working of trains and the general management of goods, etc. This training would probably be better obtained by actual deputation to the railway than through a course at a Railway Police Training School. He did not, however, believe that any makeshift arrangement of the sort proposed in the question could be effective. The railway should be empowered to have their own Police Department, both for the prevention of crime and the maintenance of order on their premises. The officers of this force should be invested with magisterial powers. The railways would then be in a position to make such arrangements as they found best for co-ordination between their Traffic, Claims and Police Departments.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, did not think that any advantage would accrue from any such arrangement.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, thought that it would be advantageous to send Prosecuting Inspectors of the Police Department to the Traffic Claims Department, where they would learn the railway point of view and the railway would learn the police point of view. The deputation should be a permanent arrangement. The railway wanted the police to assist them as they had no detective agency.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that an efficient *liaison* should be possible by deputing an Assistant Superintendent of Police to the Traffic Department who would have control of the Traffic Department's Watch and Ward as well as of the Government Railway Police. He would be responsible for the safeguarding of property and for the investigation from a police point of view of such losses as occurred. He would retain his position as a police officer.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, thought that the police should receive training in the Train Running Section and the Claims Section.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, stated that the proposed deputation would not work well unless the officers were well trained.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Logan, Agent, did not think that an exchange of officers between the railway and the police was desirable. He referred to his answer to question 19, in which he advocated the establishment of special railway branches to existing Police Schools.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that at present he did not think that the railway police took much notice of what was said to them by railway officers. He thought perhaps if they were given to understand that in cases where their conduct had been adversely reported on by railway officers, which on investigation was found to be correct, severe notice would be taken, some improvement would take place. He did not think that the transference of railway officers to police duties and *vice versa* would do any good. In regard to the investigation of claims cases, the Traffic Department were quite capable of making such investigations and with reference to the employment of police officers in the Claims Branch the Company had already their legal adviser, who was an *ex-Police* Prosecuting Inspector. Presumably if a police officer was deputed to the Claims Branch, it was not intended that he should make the police investigation concurrently with the Traffic investigation of the case. The former would still be conducted as at present. He did not think that much advantage would accrue from giving sub-inspectors training in the Claims Branch but he did not think the railway would have any objection, if the police authorities thought it desirable to give their officers some preliminary training, to taking officers, such as Assistant Superintendents of Police, on deputation to the Traffic Branch for a period of six months or so in order that they might learn something about the running of trains. The relations between the officers of the South Indian Railway dealing with claims and the police were most cordial. The officer in charge of the Claims Branch did a great deal by demi-official correspondence and discussion.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, referred to his reply to question 19.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, thought that the railway could be helped by the police in legal matters, but he did not know whether it would be any help to policemen to receive a training in railway work. At any rate he did not think that much good would result from the suggested deputation.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, referred to his reply to question No. 13.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madurai, and *Mr. Ramchandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort*, were not in favour of the suggested mutual deputation.

East Indian Railway.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, was of opinion that the deputation of railway officers to the police or *vice versa* would not, beyond admitting of a knowledge of the system of working, effect any general improvement in the existing conditions.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, did not think that any useful purpose would be served by any such system. Some arrangement whereby a police officer would be deputed to the railway for six months before being sent to take charge as a Superintendent would probably help him to understand the railway point of view and would also assist him in connection with his enquiries. He would understand the various checks exercised and the different points which ought to receive attention in order to localize a case of theft and he would have special knowledge in connection with accidents. This arrangement would be of advantage provided the Superintendent remained on the railway for at least a definite term of years. At the present moment the Superintendent remained for six months only; consequently there could be no effective co-operation at all.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, was not in favour of the suggestions and as regards the employment of police officers in the Claims Branch thought it would be much more satisfactory if there was a separate Detective Department in the police to deal with this class of work.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, stated that the suggestions would cause hopeless chaos, both in railway and police offices.

Babu Kalka Prasad, Station Master, stated that he was not in favour of the suggestions. There would be confusion without any good resulting.

Bengal Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, did not consider the proposal of deputing a railway officer to the police force or *vice versa* would have any beneficial effect.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Coates, Agent, and Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, were of opinion that it might be of assistance if police officers received training in the Traffic Department—especially in the Claims Section for 2 or 3 months partly for their own benefit and partly for better understanding of the railway point of view in these matters.

Mr. Meakins, District Traffic Superintendent, and Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, Serajganj, did not think that any good would result from the proposed deputation.

Mr. Minahan, Transportation Inspector, thought that railway police officers should be trained in goods transhipment and the working of trains.

Mr. Dench, Station Master, suggested that it would be an improvement if police officers were employed in the Claims Section; some of the Claims Tracers were not sufficiently well trained in tracking missing goods, etc. Policemen of wide experience should be selected.

Assam Bengal Railway.

Mr. Nolan, Agent, thought it would be possible to improve the efficiency of subordinate police officers by deputing them for a period to the Claims Branch of the Traffic Department, where they could acquire a knowledge of the routine working of the department and of railway rules and bye-laws. It might also be useful to depute subordinates of the Railway Claims Branch to the police.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that the knowledge of the railway police in matters affecting railway transportation and commercial working was *nil* and he welcomed any scheme for the deputation of police officers to the Traffic Department to secure knowledge of the routine working of the department and it would undoubtedly pay the railway in the long run to spend some care and attention on such training.

Babu M. Ghosh, Station Master, was of opinion that the training suggested in the question was desirable. The railway police should not be independent of the railway administration.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager, did not think that any system of *liaison*, e.g., traffic officers working with the police or police officers working with the Traffic Department would be of much practical use. Each department should do its own work but be in touch with the other.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, thought that more cases might be enquired into jointly by the railway and the police and that such enquiries should be made much more promptly after the occurrence. To make this workable it would be necessary to have a few railway police inspectors or sub-inspectors attached to the Claims Office so that there would be no difficulty in fixing up appointments.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, considered that the railway traffic and railway police officers should be more in touch with one another than they were at present and suggested that this might be brought about by joint meetings for discussing important matters. A temporary or permanent transfer of officers from one branch to the other would not in his opinion bear good results.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, did not think that any more effective system of *liaison* was possible and was doubtful whether much benefit would accrue by placing railway and police officers on deputation in the manner suggested.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, Karachi, stated that he held to the principle that each one should mind his own job and specialize in it, but that there was no objection to an official of the Criminal Investigation Department working in conjunction with the Commercial Inspector in particular cases necessitating prompt and careful investigation.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, mentioned that he had already touched upon the subject in his answer to question 13, and further desired to state that it was desirable to transfer a certain number of railway police inspectors to the railway traffic department

as heads of the Detective Department generally to watch the work of the railway police and traffic subordinates with a view to safeguarding the interests of the railway. A similar transfer of a few traffic inspectors to the railway police was equally desirable and was likely to conduce to better administration and better investigation of cases at the hands of the railway police. He regarded the employment of police officers in the Claims Branch of the Traffic Department as impracticable and undesirable. In the first instance, the interference of police officers beyond the above suggested manner would affect the judicious disposal of claims cases and on the other hand the Traffic Department would lose the confidence of the public and the mercantile community. The Traffic Claims Branch would work much better without the employment of police officers.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, thought that there was nothing wrong with the present system, if officers made a serious effort to co-operate. A railway policeman after he had been on the railway for about six months obtained a very good idea of railway work and he did not consider that he would learn very much more than he had already learnt by a formal deputation to the railway. He had not found any railway policeman backward in the understanding of the different registers maintained by railways or in his knowledge of the system of Line Clear. But he would naturally learn more quickly if deputed for the special purpose of familiarizing himself with everything connected with his duties than if allowed to pick up the information in the course of his work. He did not think that the detective experience of police officers would be of much use to the railway in the Claims Branch itself, but the railway had already appointed two *ex-police* officers as Traffic Inspectors.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, did not think that any advantage would be obtained by the proposed deputation.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, Gorakhpur, did not think that any such system would be possible or if instituted would be satisfactory.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, could not think of any effective system of *liaison*.

Rohilkund and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, did not consider that the deputation of a railway officer to the railway police or *vice versa* would give any practical results, nor did he consider that the employment of a police officer in the Claims Branch of the Traffic Department would be beneficial. Cases requiring investigation were promptly reported to the police and he had found that the railway police officials quickly assimilated sufficient knowledge of railway routine to enable them to carry out such investigations. Work in the Claims Branch was purely clerical and not detective. It might be advantageous in certain cases, but not in the majority, for the railway to have the detective experience of a police officer for purposes of making investigations which Traffic Inspectors sometimes had to make. If it was intended by means of this training to give the police officer an opportunity to understand something more about the working of the railway, the Line Clear system, etc., for the purpose of enquiring into accidents and also that he should understand something about the booking of goods and the check that was supposed to be exercised, he thought that he would hardly learn that in an office: he would have to be posted to a station and to work there, but he had always found them quite efficient and with quite sufficient knowledge to do all that was required of them.

Mr. Jahans, Traffic Claims Inspector, stated that joint enquiries by railway and police inspectors in large claims cases were essential.

Pundit Amrit Lal Tewari, Station Master, Budann, was of opinion that the suggestions would be useful as men of both departments would have thorough experience of each other.

Question 16.—*Is any system of rewards in force in the Claims Department, e. g., are rewards given for recovery of goods—*

- (a) *in proportion to the value of goods recovered;*
- (b) *out of the sums set apart by the railway administration to cover claims,*
- (c) *out of fines?*

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

No.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

No.

Rao Saheb G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, thought it advisable to give rewards in proportion to the value of the property recovered and from the fines fund to encourage the staff.

Bombay Baroda and Central India Railway.

No.

Mr. Peckey, General Traffic Manager, stated that it was possible that a system of rewards for information that would lead to the detection of thefts might have good results, but for reasons which were apparent the system of offering rewards for information or for the recovery of property was not much practised.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that there was no system of rewards. Particularly good detection of a theft or a smart piece of work in preventing theft was specially reported to the Traffic Superintendent and the man was recommended for reward or promotion.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

No system ; but very occasionally rewards are granted.

South Indian Railway.

No.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that rewards were paid out of a sum set apart for the purpose. They were given for the recovery of goods to the staff not concerned in the charge of the goods if they had shown energy in recovering them.

Bengal Nagpur Railway.

No.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, was in favour of the establishment of a regular system. Rewards were frequently given by the Agent to the police or railway staff.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

No, but rewards are occasionally given.

Assam Bengal Railway.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that there was no system of rewards in force in the Claims Department, although in a few special cases rewards had been given to the staff. He thought it was quite possible that the institution of such a system would lead to bogus cases, and was not in favour of the suggestion.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Bealish, Traffic Manager, stated that rewards were not granted in claims cases for goods recovered, etc.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that the matter had been discussed but no decision had been reached.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, described a system for which he got sanction about 8 or 10 years ago. It was still in force, but the rewards given were too small. It was necessary to secure a conviction before a reward was granted.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, was in favour of a system of rewards.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

No.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, was of opinion that any such system would lead to an increase in theft. Good work was recognised by promotion and occasionally by reward, each case being judged on its merits.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

No.

Question 17.—Are fines imposed as punishments by the railway authorities in cases where negligence or connivance in regard to losses is proved or suspected ?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, stated that fines were imposed where absolutely necessary, but the railway administration did not believe in fines and kept them as low as possible. There were other ways of punishing the staff for carelessness or misconduct. Debts might be raised and in bad cases dismissal might be ordered, thus confiscating the Provident Fund bonus and the gratuity at the end of service.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that recourse to fining was not had to any considerable extent and was only imposed on highly-paid men. The system of fining or debiting was a satisfactory form of punishment. It was not practised to such an extent as to cut down a man's earning to less than a living wage. If a man was found guilty frequently he was removed from his place altogether. The low-paid clerk was not debited. A register was maintained in which a record of each offence against a clerk was made. Fines and debits averaged from Re. 1 to Rs. 50 depending on the nature of the case. A debit could be defined as the liability to recoup losses by men responsible for the shortage.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, stated, with reference to the complaint that in some railways fines and other punishments were awarded to the employees so frequently that their earnings were affected to a large extent, that he did not think that these complaints held good in the case of State Railways. He had heard of very large debits on Company lines. His railway had a system of making marks: black caution marks, red caution marks, etc. Men were warned when these were made and if found persistent in offending were either dismissed or prosecuted.

Mr. Walsh, Traffic Inspector, did not think that the system of fine or debit was abused. If there was no such system it would be impossible to keep men under discipline.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Yes.

Mr. A. C. Rumboll, Agent, did not think that the system of debits and fines was abused.

Bombay Baroda and Central India Railway.

Yes.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, stated that as a matter of fact the officers of the railway did not care to fine their employees. They gave the offender the necessary warnings, fined him twice or thrice and if he still persisted dispensed with his services. It was easier to get rid of a man than to fine him. Officers avoided fining menials.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that fines were imposed and other disciplinary action taken in cases where the staff were considered guilty of neglect of duty. Fines were not imposed when connivance was proved or suspected. In such cases men were dismissed from the service.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, did not think that the fines imposed were sufficient to put a stop to malpractices. He suggested that when six cases were proved against a member of the staff he should be dismissed. Debiting the men towards the cost of claims led them to dishonesty in order to make good the amount recovered from their salaries.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that where negligence was proved, the staff was punished by fine or debits and where connivance was proved, the staff was summarily dismissed.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that in cases where negligence or connivance in regard to losses were proved or suspected, not only were fines imposed, but the staff was reduced and transferred and made to contribute towards the claims paid from their salaries or profits from handling contracts, and in extreme cases, were discharged or dismissed from the service.

The other witnesses agreed that fines were imposed as punishments. No witness, however, stated that the system was abused or complained of the system.

Bengal Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, said that there was a system of fining. There was a rule that any fine over 10 per cent. of the officer's pay had to be reported to the General Traffic Manager by every District Traffic Superintendent and the matter was enquired into.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that negligence was met by debiting the person or persons concerned with a portion or whole of the amount of the claim. Connivance proved or suspected would result in discharge from the service.

The system of fines was not in the opinion of witnesses abused.

Assam Bengal Railway.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that fines were imposed and punishments awarded by the railway authorities in case of negligence in regard to losses, but so far as the low-paid staff was concerned, it had been the accepted policy on this railway to avoid punishing them by fine.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager, stated that both fines and debits were imposed by the railway on the staff in cases of loss or damage in which the staff were held to be responsible or in which they showed exceptional neglect. In extreme cases of neglect or collusion with criminals the staff were dismissed or discharged. The fine could not amount to more than $\frac{1}{4}$ th of a man's salary and any debit of more than Rs. 5 had to go to the Deputy in charge of Claims. Debits were spread over a period.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, stated that fining was discouraged. Cases were disposed of individually by transfer, reduction or dismissal.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, agreed.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, Gorakhpur, stated that fines were imposed as punishment.

Rohilkhund and Kumaun Railway.

Yes.

Question 18.—Is there much unreported loss or crime? If so why are reports not made?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, thought that many cases were not reported. He referred to his reply to Question 11 in which he stated that the police and traffic staff were implicated and the railway would not have the time to investigate all cases that occurred at present.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that there was much unreported loss and crime due to thefts being committed by the railway staff and the police and also due to the fact that people did not like to report small shortages. If a clerk knew that there was shortage in a consignment for which he had been given a clear receipt he would try to conceal it. The police practically did nothing in such cases.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bareilly, stated that the staff were apt to suppress until they tell out over shares.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Bara Banki, stated that if the loss was trifling the public did not report, because they did not wish to be bothered about going to court. If, however, the loss was a big item then they proceeded with the case and reported the matter.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, was unable to say whether there was much unreported loss or crime.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, and Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, stated that there was no unreported loss or crime.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, stated that not all losses but only important cases were reported, the reason being that such reports did not appear to be liked by the police who in almost every case required a considerable amount of proof with a final inevitable refusal to trace further. In every case reported to the police, the entire staff in or about the locality were taken away to the police *chowki* for evidence to be taken at the convenience of the police staff during which time the station was worked short-handed.

Rao Sahab G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, stated that there was a certain amount of unreported loss or crime, due to the desire of the public to avoid attendance at Police Courts, worry, etc.

Bombay Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Tydd, Goods Agent, Carnac Bridge, stated that there was not much unreported loss or crime. All cases of theft were reported except when they were very petty.

Mr. Green, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, stated that the public reported much more frequently than they used to do. Their attitude at Ahmedabad, Broach, and Nadiad had entirely changed. They put cases into Court almost at once.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, stated that the public reported freely. He did not think there was much truth in the allegation that the public were unwilling to report small shortages for fear that they would be troubled later by the station people. In such cases the Traffic Superintendent enquired whether the consignment was booked at owner's risk or railway risk. If it was booked at owner's risk they were not likely to get their claims and therefore they did not report. He did not think they were afraid of station masters.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, did not think that there was much loss which was not claimed for by the public. There was a certain amount of loss which was not reported to the police. This, as a rule, was owing to the delay in fixing the locality of the loss. With regard to the suggestion that the public were shy of coming forward to put their claims for various reasons, he could only recall one case within his personal knowledge. The man said that he was tired of making claims for petty thefts and he remarked to him "You cannot expect your railway to put these things right unless you tell them what is going on. You do not report and consequently we cannot remedy any wrongs."

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, did not consider that there was much unreported loss or crime.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, agreed but added that owners sometimes, rather than be troubled with attending Courts, refused to make complaints for pilferages detected when taking delivery.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that he was not aware of any unreported loss or crime.

Messrs. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, and Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, agreed.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, stated that he had heard of a few cases.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, stated that minor claims not noticed at the time of unloading were settled by the staff with the parties concerned.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that he was not aware of the extent of unreported losses or crime. Some proportion, however, of losses or crimes must remain unreported and the only reason he could assign for that was that the losses or crimes were of a trivial nature and the persons affected were disinclined to go to the trouble and inconvenience of bringing them to notice.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, stated that there was much unreported loss and crime especially in cases of thefts of articles such as fruit, etc., booked at owner's risk.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, stated that there was a large amount of unreported loss of fresh fruit. Reports were not made in these cases and they were not always detected, because the public did not make complaints other than general ones in the newspapers.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, stated that there were not many such cases.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, stated that every crime was reported except those which were due to the fact that the police and the traffic department did not desire them to be reported.

Babu Kalka Prasad, Station Master, stated that all cases were reported by the railway staff when they came to light but many cases were not taken up by the police for certain reasons.

Bengal Nagpur Railway.

No.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, stated that there was a certain amount of pilfering, pocket picking, etc., which was not reported as the persons affected either did not consider it worth while reporting or because they did not want to be involved in correspondence or police enquiries.

Assam Bengal Railway.

The witnesses were of opinion that there was a very considerable amount of unreported losses but in view of the trouble which lengthy correspondence involved, merchants in all probability abstained from making claims.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager, was of opinion that there was a certain amount of unreported loss by pilferage of a petty nature such as coal being taken out of trucks in small quantities and tampering with consignments of fresh fruit and fire-wood. As it was difficult to prove such cases and the loss was small the public were unwilling to report. As regards crimes of violence to persons he thought that these were reported and that there was no tendency to concealment.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, referred to his replies against Questions 5 (e) and 7.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, stated that there was much unreported loss and crime. Reports were not made in order to avoid the trouble which the reporter anticipated from the police generally. The Railway Police did not like to show large numbers of crimes in their registers apparently with the object of either avoiding the trouble of investigation when there was no likelihood of tracing a particular crime or to give colouring to their reputation of having done good work owing to the small number of crimes reported within their jurisdiction. In some cases the persons reporting were detained and incurred expenses and worry and in addition their houses were subjected to search. All these facts went a long way to dissuading persons from making reports in many cases. Recently a case occurred in which a railway servant's property was stolen from a house situated in railway premises. On his reporting the matter to the Railway Police he was directed to go to the District Police. The District Police Station being closed, the man had to telegraph to the Superintendent, Railway Police, and it was only after the Sub-Inspector, Railway Police, received orders from his Superintendent that he took up the case.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, did not think that there was much unreported loss or crime. When the Company's servants failed to report the public was almost certain to do so.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, agreed.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, thought that all losses were reported.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, and *Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra*, agreed.

Rohilkund and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that there was not much unreported loss or crime.

Mr. Juhans, Traffic Claims Inspector, stated that station masters only reported in instances in which consignments could not be delivered under clear receipt as much inconvenience and trouble was experienced by merchants and railway staff over police enquiries into petty thefts.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, stated that there was much unreported crime, but it was difficult to prove it.

Pundit Amrit Lal Tewari, Station Master, Budawn, stated that there was no unreported crime at his station.

Question 19.—*The Railway Police are at present organized on a provincial basis. Would any other system of organization, in your opinion, be an improvement on this, e.g., (a) imperialization, (b) an organization which would take the railway system as the unit and make the Superintendent of Police for most purposes the Head of a Railway Department; (c) a system under which the Railway Police would be amalgamated with the District Police.*

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Mr. Harvey, Agent, did not think that (c) would be any gain. He advocated a real Railway Service which would enable the officers to rise to Rs. 2,500, the pay of the Head of a Railway Department. Two Inspectors-General would be required. He did not think that there would be any risk of want of co-operation with the Police of other Railways.

Colonel Anderson, Traffic Manager, suggested that the Railway Police and the District Police should be entirely separated. Railway Police work was very difficult and much more technical knowledge was required than in District Police work. It was however most important that there should be a close *liaison* between the two forces, otherwise it would not be possible to suppress running train thefts which had been fairly frequent at Moghalsarai. If the Railway Police were to be amalgamated with the District Police it would be reverting to the provincial organization and to the present difficult anomaly that a long special training in railway work was necessary for a policeman in the Railway Police which he did not at present get. He would like to see a Detective Section established for the Railway Police, but care would have to be exercised so that friction did not arise from the reports of these men between the Traffic staff and the Railway Police.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, was in favour of establishing a Railway Police headquarters under the Railway Board for all railways.

Mr. Young, District Traffic Superintendent, Bureilly, thought that each railway should have its own police and the Superintendent should be kept on the railway for several years. At present the police were confined within provincial boundaries. Under his scheme they would be confined within railway boundaries. The difficulty could be overcome by appointing an Inspector-General of Railway Police for the whole of India.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Rumboll, Agent, stated that two problems had to be solved:—(1) passenger train thefts, and (2) goods train thefts. Passenger train thieves were not confined to any particular locality. They passed from one province to another and an Imperial Police organization would be best suited to deal with that sort of crime. In goods train thefts, the thieves were confined to a particular locality and an Imperial Police force would not be best able to deal with them for the reason that they would not get the necessary co-operation from the District Police. A provincial system was best suited to deal with goods train thefts as the District Police and the Railway Police were under the same Inspector-General who could see that there was co-operation and could exchange his men if they were not satisfactory. That could not be done with an imperial force. Personally, from the railway point of view, his position was that there should be an imperial organization for passenger train thefts and a provincial organization for goods train thefts, but as the latter were of greater importance to the railway, he considered that the provincial system should be retained. He did not approve of having a separate Police Department for railways which would mean another Inspector-General. He thought that Mr. Ross's scheme of an Imperial Inspector-General and four Deputy Inspectors-General, would, if introduced, give rise to friction with the District Police. The Railway Police were absolutely dependent on the District Police. If they did not get the co-operation of the District Police, they would find it difficult to deal with offences that took place on the railway line. With reference to the suggestion that the District Police might control the Railway Police, he stated that the system was in vogue in the Central Provinces before it was revised by the last Police Commission. He did not approve of the suggestion because the districts were so small, and the railway authorities would not know with whom to deal.

Mr. Alexander, General Traffic Manager, stated that the essential requirement was greater co-operation by the District Police from whose jurisdiction the majority of the thieves came and to whose jurisdiction the majority of the goods passed. The Committee's investigations would probably disclose whether this could be improved by imperialization of the Railway Police, by making the railway system the unit or by amalgamating the Railway Police with the District Police.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, was of opinion that the present organization of the Railway Police on a provincial basis should continue.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, was not in favour of the imperialization of the Railway Police. The Railway Police should be a Railway Department with a

Superintendent similar to the head of a Railway Department in close touch with all districts of the railway, but crime should be dealt with by the District Police of the district where committed. At present crime was committed in a narrow belt of land running through the districts; thieves from villages under the jurisdiction of the District Police robbed goods from railway yards and running trains and disposed of them in the district. Unless the District Police were informed by the Railway Police that a crime had been committed, they appeared to know nothing about it.

Mr. Gwynne, Traffic Inspector, Jalgaon, thought that a Superintendent of Police as head of a Railway Department would provide a great incentive to stamping out crime, and to dealing with the present numerous thefts in goods yards and running trains.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, thought that there should be a separate Police Department for railways under an Inspector-General with Superintendents of Police under him. His reasons for advocating such a step were that the police staff would have greater experience in dealing with railway matters under various conditions. He was not in favour of (b) or (c). He did not think that the Railway Police should be interchangeable with the District Police.

Rao Saheb G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, considered that the present system was satisfactory, except in the matter of transfers of officers and men which should not be made so frequently. It was advisable to keep Railway Police officers permanently on a railway as far as possible.

Bombay Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Pechey, General Traffic Manager, was in favour of alternative (b). In any system, however, close co-operation with the District Police would be essential as most of the thefts were committed by outsiders. *Liaison* officers between the Railway and the District Police seemed to be required. If the Railway Police force were made into a separate force, there would be, in his opinion, reasonable prospects of promotion. He compared the present position with that of a man who was a member of a family and knew everything that was going on in it while an outsider did not. If the railways had their own Police, there would be no difficulty in securing co-operation with other railways. He did not think that difficulty would be experienced in regard to co-operation if the Railway Police were separated from the District Police and made a railway department, because their main interests would be for the railway, which was not the case at present. He thought that under such a scheme the co-operation of the police of one railway administration with the police of another railway would work quite well as it did in other departments where the railways always worked in co-operation with another.

Mr. Green, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims Section, was of opinion that the Railway Police should be under the control of the Agent and departmental officers. If railway officers could have the power of controlling the police in the way of punishments and transfers, better results would be obtained.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Colonel Magniac, Agent, stated that as regards the general working, he did not think the present system was satisfactory. The percentage of cases in which offenders were traced was small and many cases were refused on the ground either that they were outside the jurisdiction of the particular police officer referred to, that they had been received too late or that the articles found short were short-loaded at forwarding stations. Generally speaking, it was his opinion that under the existing police organization, police officers considered the "Crime" part of their duties as more important than that of assisting railways in detecting cases of theft and of its prevention. From a railway point of view, the weakness of this organization was the distribution of police in accordance with provinces and states and to their not conforming with railway areas. This tended to encourage a shifting of responsibility in cases of loss on through traffic. There was a tendency to consider reports to the Inspector-General of Police or the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Criminal Investigation Department and Railways, on matters relating to the departments of those officers as more important than purely railway questions. Officers for the Railway Police were selected from the District Police and were promoted in accordance with the recommendations of the Inspector-General of their provinces. He was of opinion that there would be considerable advantages from the railway point of view in a system of organization under which each railway system was treated as a separate unit with a separate Superintendent of Railway Police appointed to control it. The Head of the Railway Police might then be considered as a railway officer in regard to all questions affecting Watch and Ward and Law and Order, and either the Agent or the head of the Department concerned would be consulted in regard to the strength, distribution, working and housing of the Railway Police, without, however, any interference being permitted in matters of discipline. This would facilitate the Railway Police taking over the control of all the Watch and Ward staff and some system of appointing *chowkidars* in place of the existing Watch and Ward railway employees might usefully be

inaugurated. Under the present system of Watch and Ward the Railway Police had no responsibility and the District Police had no direct *liaison* with the Railway Administration. To facilitate co-operation, it might be arranged for the Superintendent of Railway Police to be given an office in the same building as that of the Agent and the principal heads of Departments, and Prosecuting Inspectors of Police might be attached to the Claims Branch of the Traffic Department. The difficulties of this proposal lay in devising an organization for the higher administrative control of the Railway Police, owing to the number of Presidencies and Native States served by a railway. It was a matter of considerable importance that there should be no lack of co-operation in joint working between the District Police and the Railway Police, and it was admitted that it might be difficult to devise a system under which the proposed Head of the Railway Police could carry out the orders of the different Inspectors-General and Deputy Inspectors-General of the Presidencies and of the Native States served by the railway system of which he was in charge. Possibly, the solution might be found by some system of imperialization, an Inspector-General of Railway Police being appointed to each railway system with assistant officers for each Presidency or Native State traversed by his system. Under the existing conditions it must, he thought, be admitted that there was not a sufficiently close *liaison* between the Railway Police and the various Railway Departments, and that there was some lack of knowledge on the part of the police of the difficulties peculiar to railway working owing to its special technical character.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, favoured a system of organization which would be a combination of imperialization with the taking of each railway system as a separate unit and making the Superintendent of Railway Police for most purposes the head of a Railway Department. For instance, the head of the Railway Police might be considered as a railway officer in regard to all questions affecting Watch and Ward and Law and Order. The Agent would not, however, interfere in any way in matters of discipline, but either the Agent or the head of the Department concerned would be consulted in regard to the strength, distribution, working and housing of both the Order and the Watch and Ward Police. To facilitate co-operation, it would be desirable for the Superintendent of Railway Police to have his office in the same building as that of the chief railway departments. If the system could be given effect to, it would assist in removing the disadvantages inherent in the present Watch and Ward system, as the Superintendent of Railway Police would be able to take over the Watch and Ward. It was not, however suggested that the Watch and Ward should be enrolled under precisely the same conditions with regard to pay, pension, etc., as constables of the Police Department, since this might be too heavy a burden on the railway budget and some modified system of *chowkidars* might be found feasible. As regards the allocation, strength and working, (*vide* Question 13) this should be modified in accordance with the above suggestions. This system would also admit of a ready *liaison* between the Police and the Railway, and it would be advantageous for Prosecuting Inspectors of the Police Department to be attached to the Traffic Claims Department. At present there were four District Superintendents of Police on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway system. To have one Railway Police head for the whole railway system was the natural thing, but the difficulty that would crop up at once would be under whom would that head work. He could not appoint himself. He must be appointed by someone else. He could not be under the Madras Government any more than under the Bombay Government. Then again, the railways ran through various presidencies and states so that there were slightly different methods. For instance, the Inspector-General of Police, Madras, had asked if there would be any objection to his stopping the verification of the characters of railway menials as he thought it led to nothing. On the other hand, the Inspector-General of Police, Bombay, had represented to his Government to give certain orders regarding the arrest of railway servants. These latter orders did not apply to the Madras Presidency and it was very hard to deal with such matters if different Governments issued different orders. The railway staff were liable to transfer from Presidency to Presidency and he thought that a certain amount of confusion was bound to arise. He did feel that there should be some definite orders issued about the Railway Police. There were rules and orders in the railway department, but the railway policeman, if referred to these orders, would invariably say that he had nothing to do with them. The railway had no means of knowing where they were and did feel that where they ran through different provinces, the Madras Government should lay down something to which the Bombay Government should agree. It was wrong in principle not to have such uniformity. All the railways felt that they should have their own police staff, and naturally that would lead to imperialization. Regarding the suggestion that the Imperial Inspector-General should be a Member of the Railway Board, he stated that he had not considered the matter so far as that. He did not think that a policeman could possibly work under the Railway Board in the way a policeman would work under the General Traffic Manager. The Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway were not as much in touch with the Bombay Police as they were with the Madras Police, although they ought to be in touch with them. He did on one occasion see a Bombay Officer. The railway felt that if they had to deal with only one man, it would be much better. Another matter pressed by the railway was that the Railway Police did not seem to have any powers outside railway premises. For instance, a *bazaar* was being held outside railway premises, and a good deal of railway goods which had obviously been stolen were being sold there. The Railway Police had no powers in that case, because they had no jurisdiction outside railway premises. Co-operation was necessary not only between the Railways and the Railway Police.

but also between the District and Railway Police. If there was a Railway Police force attached to the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, with a Superintendent of Police, or Deputy Inspector-General, the interests of both would be identified and the railway would be able to get more out of it. At present the railway had four Superintendents, each man looking after two or three railway systems.

Mr. Parsons, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that each railway system should have its own Government Railway Police, distinct from the District Police. The metric gauge system of the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway ran through five different police charges, Bombay, Mysore, Madras, Portuguese India and the dominions of His Exalted Highness the Nizam, and where the actual place of theft was unknown or in doubt, the railway usually received the reply "beyond my jurisdiction."

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, stated that the police would do better work if placed under the railway and if the railway could prosecute them. That was the crux of the matter.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, was in favour of an organization which would take a railway system as a unit and make the Superintendent of Police for most purposes the head of a Railway Department; thereby both departments would be held equally responsible for shortages.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Logan, Agent, favoured an organization which would take the railway system as the unit, each such system to be in charge of a Superintendent ranking as the head of a railway department and having the Watch and Ward under his control. This would necessitate the division of all the railways in India into 2 or more groups, with an Inspector-General of Police in charge of each, whose functions would be similar to that of an Inspector-General of Constabulary in England, who made periodical inspections and reported the result to the local authority with any recommendation he might have to make for improvements or for remedying defects. In the case of the Railway Police, the local authority would be the Agent of the Railway concerned and in regard to the Superintendent, he should be specially selected from the Indian Police and seconded for a period of 5 years. Under the above system, the cost to the railway should not be more, allowing of course for extensions in the shape of new lines than it was now, and the Criminal Investigation Department work should be carried out and paid for by Government. A railway branch should be attached to existing Police Schools where special training could be imparted to Railway Police officers and men. This training would consist principally in traffic working and dealing with claims, more especially with a view to training officers in office procedure, so that they might be better able to understand their work. Possibly this training might be carried out better by actual deputation to a railway than in a branch of the Police School.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, thought that it would be advantageous to amalgamate the Railway Police with the District Police, thereby giving the railways the help and co-operation of both. The South Indian Railway passed through 19 civil districts including Native States and French territories. He referred to his replies to Questions 13 and 14.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, stated that the present Watch and Ward on railways could not be considered as altogether satisfactory in that the staff was not drawn from a reliable class and the supervision resting as it did on the station staff on duty who had various duties to perform could not but be spasmodic. He considered that the Watch and Ward staff should be an integral part of the Police force, which should form a department of the Railway Administration under the direct control of the Agent. The Superintendent should be drawn from the Indian Police service and while serving with the Railway Police should be seconded. In the past the amount of help rendered by the Railway Police except in cognizable cases depended mainly on the individuality of the Superintendent appointed. The proposed system might necessitate some modification in the laws of cognizable cases. "Non-cognizable" was a fence behind which many cases were dumped. By amalgamating the watching staff with the police force, there would be less night duty per man and more supervision, apart from which the force should be increased. The Railway Police as at present constituted performed a considerable amount of Criminal Investigation Department work, which took them from their legitimate functions, and these investigations should be performed by special representatives of the department concerned acting in conjunction with the Railway Police.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, and *Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort*, were strongly in favour of an organization which would take the railway system as the unit and make the Superintendent of Police for most purposes the head of a railway department.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, referred to his reply to Question 13.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, was not in favour of any of the three suggestions.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, stated that the East Indian Railway had strongly maintained that the arrangement of the Railway Police force on the East Indian Railway which traversed no less than five administrations was most unsatisfactory and that unless there was at least a properly organized detective and patrol staff on the whole railway as well as on the adjacent railways, train, station, yard and goods shed thieves would simply transfer their attention to stations on that or other railways where there was no special detective and patrol staff. Such detective and patrol staff should be so organized that it would work in close co-operation with the adjoining District Police.

Mr. Presswell, Claims Officer, considered that the Railway Police should be a separate unit with a Deputy Inspector-General or Superintendent in charge and Superintendents or Assistant Superintendents appointed in charge of districts similar to the railway. This would admit of supervision and co-operation between the officers of the two departments. Transfers between the Railway and District Police were not conducive to satisfactory working. The Railway Police should have more powers in dealing with thefts traced to perpetrators residing outside the railway boundaries. References to both the Railway and the District Police involved delays. Lack of interest was also displayed due to divided responsibility. One Superintendent was wanted on the stretch of line between Cawnpore and Kaika, another one between Cawnpore and Moghalsarai and the third from Moghalsarai to Howrah. There was no risk in imperializing the Railway Police. The Railway Police should be given jurisdiction in district areas for purposes of investigation.

Mr. Robertson, District Traffic Superintendent, Allahabad, thought that what was required was that officers, inspectors and men recruited for the Railway Police should remain in the railway for the whole of their service. The head of the Police of a big Railway Company and possibly of such small Light Railways as worked directly with the big line, should have the status of a Deputy Inspector-General and should have under him district officers who should have much smaller districts than at present and would thus be able to pay far more attention to (i) prevention of thefts, and (ii) catching of thieves. It would be necessary to have a far larger police force and in such a case he would recommend that all the Watch and Ward staff on the line should be embodied in this force. This would tend to make police officers part of the railway officers' cadre and consequently there would be much more co-operation between them than there was at present. At present the Railway and the Railway Police were two separate services and they naturally had two points of view. Again the Superintendent of Police only came to the railway for a short time and there had been instances in which changes had been continually made and deputies had acted for long periods, which did not tend to improve the efficiency of the force. The amalgamation of the Railway Police with the District Police would not improve matters. In some places through which the East Indian Railway system passed the District Police had ample work to do and the railway cases lapsed into the hands of subordinates.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, was of opinion that the Railway and the District Police should be amalgamated as at present there were too many instances of one department throwing the blame of a case on to the other. In very rare and urgent cases only were the Railway Police ever of any use. If the District Police stations were conveniently situated the work could be done more easily by the District Police.

Bengal Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, was not in favour of the suggestion of imperializing the police force or of the amalgamation of the Railway with the District Police. He suggested that a senior Railway Police Officer should be appointed to the Bengal Nagpur Railway with headquarters in Calcutta and with three Assistants distributed over the line at suitable points. The subordinate police staff should remain provincial as they were at present but should be under his supervision. The Police would be mainly for Law and Order and for detective work, etc. The Watch and Ward staff would be a separate staff and would not be policemen but would be under the authority and supervision of the Railway Police Officer and would be appointed by him although actually railway staff. At present the Bengal Nagpur Railway had to deal with three railway police officers, one residing in Madras, one in Raipur, and one in Khargpur which entailed excessive correspondence and want of co-operation. If a senior police officer resided at the Railway headquarters cases could be discussed between him and the Railway Claims officers at headquarters and could be settled much more quickly and in a very much better manner than at present. There would be more chance of co-operation amongst the subordinate railway and police officials and in many instances they could be sent to make enquiries jointly with beneficial results. Moreover, a Railway Police officer or subordinate could take up a case of loss or theft and trace it all over the line. The Railway Watch and Ward staff should be placed under a system in which they would be under the control of the Railway Police Officer. This staff would probably require to be considerably augmented and the scale of pay raised so that a reliable type of man could be secured. A system of frequent transfer should be introduced so that the staff could not get friendly with or be contaminated by the station staff, local residents or merchants. The Watch and Ward should be actually railway employees as police officers would have difficulty in punishing faults, recovering debts, etc.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Coates, Agent, thought it might be of advantage to have a separate Railway Police branch with officers specially trained in Railway Police work, but an individual railway was too small to have a separate Police Department. A certain number of railways could be grouped together as was done in the case of the Government Inspectors' Branch.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, thought that the Railway Police should be kept separate from the District Police. The railways in India should be divided into circles and each circle should be in charge of an officer of the rank of Deputy Inspector-General. A Superintendent of Police should be treated as a district officer and not as the head of a railway department. All the Railway Police staff, including circle officers, would be under a Railway Inspector-General. He did not approve of the present police arrangements by which the Railway Police were under the same ultimate control as the District Police which did not bring about as much co-operation as ought to exist. He did not consider that by separating the two altogether there was any risk of diminishing co-operation, as if the Railway Police found that they were not receiving an adequate amount of co-operation they could insist upon it. He also did not approve of the suggestion that from the Superintendent upwards the force should be imperialized and from the Inspector downwards it should be under the local Inspector-General as this arrangement savoured of divided responsibility. At present in the case of lack of co-operation there was no one to take an active part in pushing co-operation. If a separate department were formed the authorities would certainly insist upon the co-operation of the District Police. The question of lack of co-operation generally arose from the fact that a man was transferred from the Railway to the District Police and *vice versa*.

Mr. Hawkins, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, recommended that the rank and file, sub-inspectors and inspectors of the Railway Police should be entertained on a provincial basis. The emoluments of the Railway Police should be higher than those of the corresponding ranks of the District Police so that the best men might be attracted. The privileges of free passes and privilege ticket order enjoyed by railway employees should be extended in full to members of the Railway Police. The present charge of the Superintendent of Railway Police was much too large. Small charges were indicated corresponding to about 2 or 3 traffic district charges. The Superintendents of each railway where more than one Superintendent was employed should be under a Deputy Inspector-General working directly under the Agent of the Railway with his office as far as possible attached to the Agent's office. The special nature of railway crime and the movements of professional criminals extending over long stretches of railway indicated the necessity of a Central Inspector-General of Railway Police controlling the Deputy Inspectors-General. A strong reserve of trained investigators should be attached to the Inspector-General's office.

Mr. Meakins, District Traffic Superintendent, thought that a Deputy Inspector-General of Police should be posted to each railway to be the head of the Railway Police Department directly under the orders of the Agent. Further, each traffic headquarters station should be made the headquarters of a Police District with an Assistant Superintendent of Police in charge.

Assam Bengal Railway.

Mr. Nolan, Acting Agent, said that Mr. Bayley, Agent, was strongly of opinion that if an Imperial Police Service were formed some at least of the causes of complaint against the Railway Police would be removed. In the first instance, the Inspector-General and the Deputy Inspectors-General would be in a position more constantly to inspect the working of the Railway Police and would have opportunities of meeting railway officers and be more in touch with the requirements of railways and railway work. By such a system means could be provided for the recruitment and special training of officers and subordinates and in course of time the personnel, both officers and men, would be more closely in touch with the special requirements of the Railway Police, and if the service was a self-contained one, the senior inspecting officers not being only temporarily deputed to the force as they were at present, would naturally take greater interest in upholding the prestige of their service, and this in itself would have a valuable effect in improving the efficiency of the force generally. Mr. Bayley held that in view of the delicate relations which existed between the Railway Police Superintendent and the Railway Officers, the position could be improved if there was a distinct understanding that police officers should within certain limits act under the direction of the Railway Administration and that it was only by such an arrangement that a railway could obtain full value of the police organization in return for the heavy expenditure incurred and he was of opinion that such an arrangement could be come to without in any way contravening the necessities or requirements of the law. He admitted that the police derived their powers from certain Acts which prescribed the manner in which the control of the police should be exercised as regards those powers but he thought that if the railway authorities were informed under what statutes they had to work they would be able to interpret them correctly. At present the railway authorities did not sufficiently study the rules and regulations, under which the police worked which probably accounted for the police attitude, which was that the railway authorities did not always understand what the police could do and what they could not do and further that if the control over the police was transferred to the railway, the railway authorities would try to push the police

into doing more than they had power to do. He further stated that there would no doubt be some difficulty in clearly allocating the duties which should be carried out under the direction of the Railway Administration, but this should not prove insurmountable. In fact the division of the duties of the Government Railway Police as laid down in paragraph 48 of the Railway Police Committee's Report of 1907 seemed clearly to indicate the lines on which such an allocation might be arrived at. Under the system suggested by him, the disciplinary control of the police would remain with their own Inspector-General, but the ordinary duties, that is to say, regulation of traffic and maintenance of order at stations, in which at present the railways only had powers of suggestion, would be transferred to the railway. He further suggested that if the Committee could not recommend the formation of an Imperial Railway Police force, the control of the Railway Police on the Bengal portion of the Railway, *i.e.*, Dacca, Mymensingh, Tipperah and Chittagong Districts, should be transferred from the Assam Police to the Bengal Police. The reasons which had led Mr. Bayley, the Agent, to make that suggestion were that there was a good deal of crime which was ascribed, rightly or wrongly, to gangs of criminals operating from outside Assam altogether. The Assam Police were not in touch with these people and did not in some cases get as much support from the districts in Bengal as they ought to have done. Another reason was the considerable neglect which he had experienced from the Assam Government in regard to the Police generally. Mr. Bayley had considered the point that if his suggestion were carried out, he would have to correspond with two sets of officers, but he preferred that position to the present system as Assam was very thinly populated and there would not be very much occasion for correspondence with that province. The more important crimes were committed in the Bengal portion of the line. It would be better to have the railway under the Government of Bengal if it was to be under one administration.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, said that imperialization might be an improvement, but he foresaw great difficulties in the way, not the least of which would be the language difficulty. The best solution of the matter would be to make the Railway Police a department of the railway under the orders of the Agent, and he saw no reason why such an arrangement should not be satisfactory. In all cases under the Railway Act, the Superintendent of Railway Police would act under the orders of the Agent. It must be remembered that it was open to the senior Government Inspector of Railways to question the Agent's decision with regard to any cases falling under the purview of Section 101 of the Railway Act. He was in favour of handing over the portion of the line in the Bengal Presidency to the Bengal Police, because the bulk of the Railway Police work actually lay in the province of Bengal. His personal opinion was that there should be only one Superintendent for the Railway and he preferred to have that Superintendent in Bengal as in that province there was a separate Deputy Inspector-General of Police in charge of Railway Police, who was easily accessible as he was a touring officer.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, and *Mr. Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Commercial*, agreed with Mr. Cooper, in thinking that the best plan would be to place the Police under the Agent as a railway department, pure and simple, the Superintendent being the head of it at least with regard to railway cases and where the law did not constitute a difficulty thereto.

Babu M. Ghosh, Station Master, was of opinion that the service should be organized as distinct from the Provincial Police with special arrangements for giving the men training that would make them most suitable for Railway Police work. This department should be controlled by the Agent of the Railway.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boalth, Traffic Manager, was of opinion that organization (b), *i.e.*, of having a Superintendent or Inspector-General of Police directly under the Agent for the whole of the Administration, was the most workable scheme. There would probably have to be exceptions in the case of Baluchistan and the North-West Frontier Province, as these provinces were quite peculiar as regards crime and police arrangements from the rest of the line. From practical working he had found that conditions were special in Baluchistan.

Mr. Hadow, Agent, agreed with Mr. Boalth's suggestion with the exception of the exclusion of Baluchistan. Both officers were agreed in thinking that it would be advantageous to have one police system for the whole of the line, the first point being that the head of the police administration would be always close at hand. Mr. Hadow thought that it was most necessary that Sind should form part of the Punjab from the point of view of the Railway. For the last year he had been trying very hard to bring the medical arrangements on the Railway under the Inspector-General of Civil Hospitals of the Punjab. The North-West Frontier Province and the United Provinces had agreed but trouble had ensued with Sind. There was apparently an idea ingrained in Bombay that Sind was a sort of island by itself which was very much hotter than any other part of India. Another argument was that the Punjab Assistant Surgeon would not understand the language. His answer to that was that half the staff on the railway at Karachi and at the workshops at Sukkur were Punjabees. If they could get on well with Sindees surely the Assistant Surgeon could also get on very well. Regarding the police officer also it was hopeless to try to get into

communication with a police officer in Sind. Both officers realized that the special objection to the scheme under which each Railway Administration would have its own police force was that to a certain extent the Railway Police ran the risk of losing touch with the District Police, but the Agent was of opinion that it was more important that the Railway Police should be in touch with the Railway because the Railway Police were there to prevent (1) violence, (2) robbery and (3) for the general investigation of crime on railways. The difficulty arose in the third object. There was a risk that if the Railway Police became a Railway Department that at times of great civil disturbance the Railway Police for instance in Karachi might be under the control of an officer who would have to report to Lahore. In these days of strikes there would be some risk if the Railway Police responsible for dealing with such matters were in the first instance under the control of somebody other than the Local Government. Again, before the suggestion were carried out, they would like to have an idea of what the cost would be to the railway. At present claims had gone up to such a figure that some improvement in organization was obviously necessary.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, was of opinion that the Police should be a department of the Railway in the same way as the Audit Department, that is, they should be directly under the Government of India, the Agent having power to co-ordinate the working of the Railway Police with the Railway, or that they should be placed on the same footing as the Traffic Department of the Railway with a Superintendent in the Head Office and District Officers with Assistants at certain points on the railway. Either of these systems would be more efficient than the present one. A difficulty under the present system was that the railway in his district came under the jurisdiction of three distinct police forces: *viz.*, Sind Railway Police, Baluchistan Railway Police and the Punjab Railway Police. With one Police Superintendent for the whole North-Western Railway as suggested the work of the Police could be better co-ordinated and instances of one police force refusing to take over a case from the police of another province would not occur. There would be some encouragement for the police under such a system to get at the bottom of a case. It was so easy under present conditions to reply to enquiries from the District Traffic Superintendent that the case was untraced and the papers filed. Under the suggested scheme the Railway Police would be working for their own railway and would take greater interest in investigating cases. The Watch and Ward staff might also come under the Police under such a system.

Mr. S. W. M. Khan, Officiating District Traffic Superintendent, Multan, stated that the head of the Railway Police Department on every Railway should be an officer of the rank of Deputy Inspector-General and should have one or two Superintendents to assist him. Each Railway should have a separate Railway Police and the whole system should be divided into districts or divisions under an Assistant or Deputy Superintendent of Railway Police. These officers would deal direct with district officers of the railway and other departments in the same way as the district officers of the different departments of the railway at present did. What was lacking at present was that a Railway Police official was inclined to consider himself, and was considered by the railway staff, more of a police officer than a railway official. What was urgently required was that the Railway Police should be able to co-operate efficiently with the railway staff in the prevention of thefts, detection of crime within railway limits and maintenance of order so as to enable railways to work efficiently in the interests of not only the trades and industries of the country but also in the interests of the general public. With this end in view he had arranged that the Railway Police should hold a joint check of the contents of wagons found with defective seals and had also arranged a joint check of seals of all goods trains at Iqbalnagar, the boundary station between Multan and Montgomery Railway Police Stations. This joint check was useful so far as it went, but the very fact that the two forces had to devise makeshifts to co-ordinate their working showed that the organization required alteration. Another method by which an effort was made to prevent running train thefts was that every case of a wagon found with defective seals at a station was reported by wire by the local railway staff to the Railway Police concerned and a copy of the wire was sent to the District Traffic Office. These wires were put up to Assistant Traffic Superintendents of the Traffic Sub-Divisions of the Multan District and cases were entered up in a register under their orders. A statement was prepared every week from this register and a copy was sent to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Railway Police, and another copy to the Traffic Manager, Claims, to enable that officer to deal with claims arising out of these thefts. In this way co-ordination was sought to be established, but the re-organization of the Railway Police as a department separate from the District Police was a necessity the importance of which could not be overestimated. He further suggested that all cases of thefts occurring within railway limits either from running trains or from staff quarters and station buildings should be investigated and dealt with by the Railway Police, the District Police helping the Railway Police whenever persons residing outside railway areas were involved in the same manner as one police station in the civil districts helped another police station of the same or another district within the former's jurisdiction in detecting crime and apprehending culprits.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, was of opinion that by organizing the Railway Police as a Railway Department subordinate to the Agent but independent of all other Railway Departments, more co-operation would be secured and a higher state of efficiency obtained.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, Karachi, was of opinion that the Railway Police should be an integral part of the Railway Administration under the control of the Agent.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, stated that a reference to answers 13 to 15 would show his views on the subject. In his opinion an organization which would take the railway system as the unit and make the Superintendent of the Railway Police a head of the Railway Department under the direct control of the Agent, would be preferable to any amalgamation with the District Police whose line or sphere of working was quite different from that of the Railway Police.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Colonel Izat, Agent, suggested that there should be one force for the whole line controlled by a police officer experienced in railway work and in close touch with the administration. The force at present was split up into two absolutely distinct bodies: the "United Provinces" and "Bihar and Orissa" Police, and the successful following up and working out of cases was greatly impaired thereby. It seemed very necessary that the Railway Police should be co-ordinated under one control as an Imperial Service and that each railway should have its own Police Superintendent who should be regarded primarily as the head of a department of the Railway Administration and as such under the control of the Agent with respect to all matters connected with railway work. Government provided the force and reserved to itself the right from time to time to impose duties for its own ends upon the members of the force. The cost of the force had been fixed between the Railway and the Government on the basis of 7-10ths to 3-10ths, and this might be taken as indicating approximately the relative importance of the purely railway, and of the general duties of the Police. Owing to the language and other difficulties it would probably be found desirable to retain the present method of recruitment from the District Police, but men who had learnt, and had been found suitable for, railway duties should be permanently retained in the Railway Police. According to the information at his disposal the United Provinces Police worked in harmony with the railway officers, but the Bihar and Orissa Police did not. An imperial force would make matters more uniform.

Mr. Westwood, Traffic Manager, thought that efficiency would be secured if the Railway Police on the Bengal and North-Western Railway were placed under one Superintendent. With regard to the contention that it was practically impossible to work out Railway Police problems with any hope of success unless the Railway Police had the full co-operation of the District Police and that if a system was introduced whereby the railway system was taken as the unit for purposes of Police administration, the Railway Police would not get that assistance, he confessed that he knew very little about police organization but he did not see why the Railway Police should not get the help they required. The Railway Police might be kept provincial as at present but might be reinforced by a special Railway Detective Staff which need not be bound by the limits of a province. He quoted the case of theft of silver bars reported at Gorakhpur and then apparently referred to Howrah who said that the case did not take place on their line. The United Provinces put on a Criminal Investigation Department Officer who carried the investigation right through and found that the case had actually occurred at Howrah.

Mr. Brown, District Traffic Superintendent, Sonapur, thought that the police force should be allotted to the railway and should not be bound by the boundaries of provinces through which the railway ran.

Mr. White, Traffic Inspector, Gorakhpur, and Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, thought that an organization which would take the railway system as the unit and make the Superintendent of Police for most purposes the head of a department of the Railway Administration would be the most suitable.

Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra, stated that any improvement on the present state of the service would be welcome, but was unable to express an opinion on the suggestions mentioned in the question.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, stated that he had insufficient knowledge of police administration to offer an opinion as to whether organization upon an imperial basis would be an improvement upon the existing provincial system; but it appeared that the retention of an official in one province throughout his service was advantageous in that a better knowledge was obtained of the manners and customs of the people than would be obtained by an official subject to transfer from one province to another.

Pundit Amrit Lal Tewari, Station Master, Budawn, thought that the present system was better than any of those proposed.

Question No. 20.—Can you give any instances of malpractices on the part of railway or police subordinates which have come under your own immediate observation? and can you suggest any measures for checking such malpractices?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan, District Traffic Superintendent, Claims, mentioned two instances. In one case the Station Master on duty at Benares Cantonment asked for money from a passenger and as he did not pay he put him to trouble. The man complained an enquiry was held and the Station Master was punished. The other was a case of a police constable who stole a *chatty* of *ghee* from a passenger in a passenger waiting hall. He was prosecuted and punished.

Mr. Naidu, Station Master, Bara Banki, stated that he had been for a number of years stationed at Hardwar. On several occasions he noticed constables at every window of the five or six booking offices kept open at the time of *melas*. These constables did not allow any passenger to get to the window unless they were paid one anna per head. He cited another instance in which a poor widow with three or four children had come from Jullundur to deposit her husband's ashes. She came to the booking clerk for a ticket, paid the money and asked for change. It was with the greatest difficulty that she had got to the ticket window. The booking clerk asked her to bring change and threw the money back to her, in doing so keeping a rupee with himself. The woman was brought to him by a gentleman. He started a case against the Booking-clerk and suspended him but on checking the cash found no money in excess.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, thought that the lower grades of the Railway and District Police, if not actively participating in thefts, in many cases refrained from capturing the actual offenders because they received a share of the spoil.

Mr. Adams, Station Superintendent, Victoria Terminus, stated that police constables were in the habit of detaining passengers who were entraining at the last moment by questioning them about excess luggage, etc. The passenger to free himself was compelled to tip or otherwise forced to detain. He had detected one such case and the two constables concerned were prosecuted and sentenced to a year's imprisonment. During *mela* times the Police caused a great deal of obstruction to passengers. If however a party paid up, they were allowed to enter the platform. The subordinate railway staff were too timid to report matters to the Station Master. The remedy was that an Inspector, Sub-Inspector or Police Sergeant should be in attendance at each train. The European Police Sergeant had no power. He was simply an ornament when present. If he was strict with constables, Sub-Inspectors made his position uncomfortable. He had to ask the Sub-Inspector's permission before giving a constable an order. Sergeants always referred the public to the Sub-Inspector.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. Jehangirji, Station Master, Baroda, gave two instances (1), Policemen who had to escort a running goods train starting in the early morning came to the station the previous evening and slept there and during the night committed theft. If the watchmen caught them they were offered a partnership and if they did not agree, the policemen involved the watchmen in some way or other. (2) Policemen moved freely about in yards and goods sheds and at certain stations there was an order that the Police should not come within the goods shed, so that the Watch and Ward were held responsible, and if anything went wrong, they had to answer.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, stated that the railway had many cases where they punished the staff for malpractices; for instance, complaints of Station Masters selling wagons. The Railway had a priority register, but it did not work satisfactorily; for instance, the case of a man with no standing or position and no goods who had registered his name for wagons. The railway found that as soon as his name came up, he would invariably go and sell his wagons in the bazaar. The railway could not prove whether the man had goods or not, so that they had to register his name. The railway did not insist on the goods being brought into the station premises before priority was given to the man, because they had not got sufficient sheds.

Mr. Henderson, Traffic Inspector, stated that he knew of several instances of malpractices but did not mention them. He considered that more supervision over the Police was required,

and that the feeling now greatly prevalent of wanting to shield police culprits for the sake of not bringing the department too much to the front should be suppressed. The railway police and the railway staff committed malpractices equally.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Logan, Agent, could not give any instances of malpractices on the part of the railway or police subordinates, but stated that he considered that theft of railway property or property in the custody of a railway by railway servants whether on duty or off duty, should by law be made punishable more severely than in the case of outsiders, preferably by imprisonment and when the property was not recovered by both imprisonment and fine.

Mr. Acres, General Traffic Manager, stated that there had been instances of both railway and police staff being concerned in carrying passengers both by passenger and goods train without tickets, also of carrying consignments free and of obtaining and selling tickets from booking offices on commission.

Mr. Rowbotham, Deputy Traffic Manager, Freight Branch, could not give any instance, but was of opinion that when cases did come to light, the culprit should receive deterrent punishment.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, mentioned no instances. He suggested that a few picked men from the Criminal Investigation Department might be employed confidentially by the Agent or the General Traffic Manager and posted without any intimation to the District Traffic Superintendent to find out weak spots and report confidentially to head quarters without reference to any executive officer. If this were done a lot of malpractices would disappear. He would not let the District Traffic Superintendent know that a Criminal Investigation Department officer was on watch.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, stated that he had heard of thefts taking place with the connivance of the police, but it was impossible to bring home such cases. He had also heard of the police carrying passengers without tickets and troubling passengers, particularly during festivals, at the booking window.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, could mention no particular instances, but suggested that it would be advantageous if a police officer was deputed to watch booking counters at train times.

East Indian Railway.

Colonel Sheridan, General Traffic Manager, could give no instances of malpractices but said that cases had been reported to him from time to time such as when the railway staff under pressure from the police extorted money from the public at the time of fairs or *melas*. The only way to check such malpractices was by deputing responsible officers to supervise and control the police on such occasions.

Messrs. Presswell, Robertson and Harrison had no remarks to offer.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, stated that he was instrumental on one occasion in arresting a police constable whom he found standing over a consignment of *dall* and causing a coolie to abstract a portion of the contents. The man was prosecuted and convicted. The only suggestion he could offer for checking malpractices was better supervision.

Mr. Harrison, Traffic Inspector, Mokameh Ghat, denied that the public were made to sign receipts without seeing the goods. If there was anything wrong weighment could be demanded, delivery could be refused or remarks made to the effect that the goods were underweight.

Babu Kalka Prasad, Station Master, was unable to cite any special instances. He stated that malpractices could only be checked if police constables were subordinated to the Station Master in the same way as railway chowkidars were. In that case both the railway chowkidars and the constables would be equally responsible for malpractices. The fear in which the police were held by the lower classes made it difficult for the latter to exercise a check on malpractices.

Bengal Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Ismay, General Traffic Manager, said that instances were frequent but there was no use in raking them up.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, was of opinion that the best measures to adopt to check malpractices were intensive supervision and the introduction of a procedure which would

prevent the giving of undue preference in the allotment of wagons. He did not think malpractices were more common than elsewhere. Malpractices which had come to his notice were generally cases of breach of trust and the demanding of illegal gratifications.

Mr. Meakins, District Traffic Superintendent, stated that malpractices were common and the only remedy was punishment on detection.

Babu P. M. Das, Station Master, Serajgunj, suggested the employment of detectives and the appointment of honorary visitors.

Assam Bengal Railway.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, stated that as far as the railway staff was concerned, it was possible to deal with them either personally or through the intervention of the Agent. but in the case of the Railway Police, it appeared almost impossible.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, mentioned that the railway staff did not run counter to the police in such matters for obvious reasons.

Mr. Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Commercial, thought it was difficult to devise a remedy in view of the great reluctance on the part of the railway staff to incur the hostility of the Railway Police by bringing malpractices to notice.

Babu M. Ghosh, Station Master, was of opinion that strong measures by officers would have a moral effect. If the promotion of police subordinates was made dependent on the recommendations of the railway district officers in whose jurisdiction they were employed, it might serve as a check.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Boalch, Traffic Manager, stated that personally he had not seen any malpractices on the part of the police but had heard of several such cases, *e.g.*, the recent case of an assault on an Anglo-Indian lady between Golra and Jand by the travelling constable. He had also heard of a case of a policeman having been detected at the last Nankana Sahib *mela* taking money from the public. He was summarily tried and sentenced by a Magistrate on the spot. In the well-known case of the murder of Miss Taylor some years ago, Shouldam, the murderer, was the son of a Police Inspector at Multan. There were many other instances in which the police themselves had taken up and punished their staff when at fault. Close supervision would go a long way towards stopping malpractices on the part of railway as well as the police.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, said that he had been informed by one of his Assistants that at *melas* he had repeatedly seen policemen taking money illegally from the public.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, suggested better supervision than at present existed on the part of both railway and police staff and an improvement in the Watch and Ward staff.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, could only suggest greater supervision on the part of inspecting officials as a means of stopping malpractices.

Mr. Foster, Traffic Inspector, Commercial, Karachi, stated that the only check against malpractices appeared to be to raise the standard by drafting in a more intelligent class of man and by improving the salaries of members of the Railway Police force.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, stated that the only measures for checking malpractices were to have a more rigorous check on the working of the staff and to arrange that all enquiries into missing consignments should be conducted jointly by Traffic and Police officials. Certain stations were being frequently reported for sending sealed van packages deficient and in a very badly pilfered condition. When these cases appeared frequently an inspector should be appointed to visit the station of despatch to watch the working of that particular station and to see and report on the reasons and causes which led to these shortages and pilferages. Stations should not be allowed to be repeated offenders without serious notice being taken. When reports continued to be received which gave reason to believe that malpractices were occurring the Police could conveniently offer help not only in putting a stop to them but probably in bringing the culprits to book.

Mr. Mool Chand, Station Master, Hyderabad, mentioned that about 9 months ago a Railway Police constable was convicted and sentenced to 4 years' rigorous imprisonment by the Sessions Judge, Hyderabad, for having committed rape on the wife of a chowkidar of the Traffic Department in the railway premises of Padidan Station. Matters of this kind were very seldom reported or brought to light for the simple reason that no husband or relative cared to spoil the reputation of his family by having recourse to prolonged and tedious legal enquiries without any assurance of his being able to succeed. Vendors and passengers often complained of harassment by Railway Police subordinates. When such matters were brought to the notice of their superiors they were not taken up seriously, with the result that ill-paid subordinates seldom mended their ways even if they were warned several times. Such cases

of malpractices could neither be fully checked nor adequately prevented unless exemplary measures were taken by the heads of the Police Department. Men on higher pay should be enlisted in the subordinate ranks. Above all, the same amount of care should be devoted to cases reported against a police subordinate as was done in handling crimes against ordinary persons.

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra, stated that the greater portion of the travelling public were ignorant people and did not yet understand their rights and acquiesced in the treatment meted out to them by the police in league with the railway subordinates who were intelligent enough not to interfere with men who would report them, but only preyed upon the ignorant, either realising excess fares on children's tickets where not due, levying charges on luggage carried with the owner by sealing it wrongly, etc. The public did not complain and the superior staff had little opportunity of checking the evil without immediate reports from the public.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

Mr. Strachan, Traffic Superintendent, could mention no cases.

Mr. Jahans, Claims Inspector, stated that he had come across many instances as a Station Master.

Mr. Gardener, Station Master, Bareilly City, stated that he knew of cases from hearsay only.

Pandit Amrit Lal Tewari, Station Master, Budawn, knew of no cases.

21. Have you any suggestions to make on any other points germane to the enquiry?

Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Khan Bahadur Mansur Ali Khan was of opinion that the District Police should be held responsible for yard thefts and running train thefts.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. Burn, Deputy Traffic Manager, Commercial, thought that the main improvement required so far as the Great Indian Peninsula Railway was concerned, was co-operation between the District and the Railway Police.

Mr. Cooke, District Traffic Superintendent, Bombay, suggested that improvement in the Watch and Ward establishment and reduction in thefts could best be effected by—

- (a) Increasing the pay and providing quarters for the Watch and Ward and so ensuring recruiting of pensioned sepoys with prospects of promotion to supervisors for satisfactory work.
- (b) Goods yards and goods sheds should be enclosed by suitable fencing so that entrance was only possible through gates which were under observation.
- (c) Yards and stations should be suitably lighted.
- (d) Building up of *esprit de corps* between all departments of the Railway and the District and the Railway Police.

Rao Saheb G. N. Gokhale, Assistant Station Master, Goods, Poona, thought that elected Station Masters should be given honorary ranks of Sub-Inspectors or Jamadars or vested with some powers which would help in minimizing crime to a certain extent as they would be able to take prompt action in detecting crime without waiting for a police officer to arrive at the spot.

Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

None.

Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

Mr. Wathen, General Traffic Manager, made the following suggestions:—

1. The Claims Branch did not know what action the Police took upon reports of losses. The usual result of the investigation was to report the cases as being "undetectable."

"short-loading," "investigation refused" owing to unidentifiable nature of the goods, or "outside jurisdiction." The Police might be doing everything possible, but the Railway did not know. The system did not tend to give the railway any confidence in their efforts.

2. The policing of railways should be a specialised subject. The constant presence of valuable goods and opportunities for fraud by railway servants and temptation to outside thieves required that counter measures should be specially studied and applied. In the past six years, there had been four Superintendents of Government Railway Police in the Madras area.

3. The interests of the Railway should be identified with those of the Police.

Mr. White, Station Master, Guntakal, stated that passengers waiting at junctions and large passenger booking stations were not sufficiently guarded against thefts while waiting for trains. During nights the practice was for the Police to turn these people out of the waiting rooms to *choultries*, so that they would not have the trouble of investigation if any theft occurred. He suggested that a system of patrolling waiting rooms every hour of the night should be adopted and the signature of the Station Master on duty obtained in token that such patrol was regularly carried out. Frequent changes in the constables was a point he would bring to notice. The men when kept too long at a station worked with the menials in extractions and thefts.

Mr. Datu Row, Station Master, Tumkur, suggested that the Railway Police should have a detective force which should be sent out to watch at heavy traffic stations and also at junctions. Travelling constables should not be allowed to travel always in a reserved compartment as at present on some sections, but should change carriages occasionally.

South Indian Railway.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, suggested the further use of Mr. Travers Phillip's patent and Pereira's master lock. There had been no thefts reported from wagons fitted with these special fittings since they were introduced.

Mr. Meritt, Station Master, Madura, suggested that when a case of theft was reported to the Police and when it was found difficult to localize it either as a theft from a station yard or from a running train, it would be preferable if police officers arrived at their own conclusions after making enquiries without calling for the file of papers from the district office, which contained reports of goods supervisors and traffic inspectors, which would have a tendency to bias their minds and induce them to arrive at a one-sided conclusion. Also the system of police constables patrolling on the off side of passenger trains, especially near female carriages, should be enforced. It would be helpful to the travelling public and minimise cases of petty thefts to a certain extent.

Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar, Station Master, Trichinopoly Fort, suggested the enhancement of demurrage to make the public remove their goods more promptly. Coolies and brokers should be licensed. Many of them were bad characters. The railway Police should patrol sheds day and night and should have power to exclude undesirables.

East Indian Railway.

Mr. Harris, Goods Superintendent, Howrah, said that he could not handle the goods as fast as received because the jemadars or sircars who worked for half a dozen different merchants took days, sometimes weeks, to complete consignments. In the meantime numerous part consignments were housed in the sheds taking up valuable space, blocking passages and causing confusion, especially making it difficult to get complete consignments on the weighing machine. A register clerk and markman was required for each section instead of for each shed and they should mark dates of arrival on each lot of goods and wharfage should be charged.

Mr. Hamilton, Goods Inspector, stated that the law at present was deficient; although railway officials knew that a theft had been committed yet cases failed through the Evidence Act. At large railway stations and yards persons arrested with stolen property or property which was believed to be stolen should prove how they came to be in possession thereof. At present the onus lay on the railway authorities to prove from where such persons obtained the property, which in a large goods shed was a most difficult matter.

Babu Kalka Prasad, Station Master, stated that enquiries in cases concerning the staff of other departments should be enquired into jointly, in other cases by the department concerned.

Bengal Nagpur Railway.

Priority Register.—*Mr. Ismay* thought that this register was very effective when there was heavy traffic and the supply of wagons was limited. Priority was strictly observed in

the granting of wagons and the public had access to these registers. The Station Master wrote down their names in their presence. There was no check on the merchants who overstated their demands or made a profession of overstating requirements. Station Masters only inspected whether the merchant had goods to be loaded and did not inspect the merchant's premises. No application would be entertained from merchants who stated that he had goods in his godown. Merchants were only allowed to register for goods actually in the yard.

Eastern Bengal Railway.

Priority Register—*Mr. Hawkins, Deputy Traffic Manager*, stated that if it were established that some merchants received preference over others the Station Master was reduced or dismissed. On the Eastern Bengal Railway goods at merchants' godowns were registered if they were within a certain radius of the station. It sometimes happened that when a merchant had 2,000 bales of jute he asked for wagons for 3,000. The Station Master was supposed to check these estimates and Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors were deputed also to check the goods in the godowns and if any man was found to have over-registered the over-registered portion was cancelled and the merchant's goods were not registered for 20 days, *vide* rules in the Traffic Working Orders and Goods Manual.

Passengers' comfort.—A number of retired Indian officers who were called 'Passenger Superintendents' were employed, whose sole business was to look after the comforts of III class passengers. Such officers were paid Rs. 105 *plus* allowances per mensem.

Cooly Traffic.—At Naihati, Santahar, and Amingaon there were medical and feeding arrangements for the cooly traffic.

Mr. Meakins, District Traffic Superintendent, suggested that the Police should be increased and that all cases in which goods had to be traced on account of losses, thefts and misdespatch should be made over to them for enquiry and report. Claims Inspectors and Tracers might then be replaced by police officers. Each junction station should have a special seal checking staff, highly paid, who would check the seals of all wagons passing through, witness check of contents of wagons with defective seals and take immediate action to trace.

Assam Bengal Railway.

Mr. Cooper, Traffic Manager, mentioned that the salaries of all railway menials and subordinate staff had been largely increased and he was of opinion that such steps should be taken towards the improvement of the prospects of the Railway Police.

Mr. Buchan, District Traffic Superintendent, suggested recruiting a more intelligent and better paid class of constables.

Mr. Purcell, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Commercial, mentioned that if the salaries of the lower grades of the Railway Police were increased, this step would go a long way towards obtaining a more suitable class of recruits.

North-Western Railway.

Mr. Hawkes, District Traffic Superintendent, Karachi Port, stated that officers should be allowed to remain in one place for a longer period than at present, and mentioned that during the last year there had been 4 Superintendents of Police at Karachi.

Mr. Schofield, Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Claims, considered that isolated loaded wagons and trains stabled in the sidings should be better protected and guarded than they were at present, as a considerable number of losses occurred from such wagons. A free use of the riveting of wagons would tend to reduce pilferages. An increase in the present number of the supervising railway staff at large stations and also inspectors for general supervision of work at smaller stations was necessary.

Mr. Jordan, Traffic Inspector, Quetta, suggested that the pay of the Police should be brought into line with that of the Traffic Department.

Mr. Ryan, Station Superintendent, Lahore, thought that better lighting would effect a great deal. The District Police should help at sidings and the "Railway would help to bring a good deal to light if more rigorous measures of check and enquiry were adopted in cases where losses are reported."

Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Lucas, Station Master, Sonapur, suggested that to avoid running train thefts as far as possible goods train should only be run during daylight.

Babu Janak Lal Jha, Station Master, Chapra, was of opinion that the subordinates of the police and railway staff should be recruited from a more intelligent class of people on more substantial pay than they received at present.

Both officers stated that there was a delay of four to ten days in giving open delivery and all packages which were to be opened could not be kept under lock and key hence pilferage occurred.

Rohilkhand and Kumaun Railway.

None.

Pilgrim Traffic.

Mr. Parker, Traffic Inspector, Trichinopoly, South Indian Railway, said that there were not enough police to watch booking offices. They kept away in order to avoid complaints. A very large police force would be required to prevent overcrowding.

Mr. Higman, District Traffic Superintendent, South Indian Railway, stated that there was no dangerous overcrowding. Additional booking offices were opened and special windows were provided for females. There were pens for the public from where they were admitted to the platform. Ticket Agents were often temple employees. They sometimes gave upcountry men local tickets.

Mr. Merritt, Station Master, Madura, stated that more police help was wanted to keep passengers out of danger of being cut up by trains. Also there were not enough police to keep an eye on cheats.

Mr. Cook, District Magistrate, Midnapur, thought that the railway should provide proper hospitals and should not object to the Civil Surgeon having his say in the matter.

Mr. Gilmore, Traffic Manager, Eastern Bengal Railway, stated that there was a large coolie traffic and special medical arrangements were made at Goalundo Ghat, Naihati and Amingaon. Special arrangements for food were also made at Naihati and Santahar.

Messrs. Lucas and Jha, Station Masters, Bengal and North-Western Railway, stated that special temporary hospitals and extra water arrangements were made.

Abstract of evidence of Trades Associations, Members of the Public, etc.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED BY TRADES ASSOCIATIONS, MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, ETC.

Question No. 1.—What is the number of members of your Association?

Question No. 2.—Are the members firms or individual members of firms?

Question No. 3.—In what classes of consignments are the members mainly interested?

Bombay.

1. *Messrs. Ralli Brothers*, a private firm mainly interested in cotton, grain, pulses, seeds and sugar.

2. *The Bombay Chamber of Commerce*, composed for the most part of European firms interested in every kind of raw produce sent from upcountry to Bombay and in imported goods.

3. *Messrs. Phillips and Company*, Chemists and Wine Merchants.

4. *The Bombay Presidency Trades Association*, consisting of 40 members limited to Europeans, representing a variety of trades such as piece-goods, liquors, oilman's stores, mills, etc.

5. *The Grain Merchants Association*, consisting of 313 members representing firms mainly interested in all kinds of grain.

6. *The Bombay Mārwarī Chamber of Commerce*, consisting of 300 members representing firms interested in cotton and all kinds of seeds and piece-goods.

7. *The Central India Spinning, Weaving and Manufacturing Company, Limited*, a Nagpur firm mainly interested in twist, piece-goods, cotton and mill stores.

8. *Messrs. Tata Sons, Limited*, a firm mainly interested in cotton yarn and cotton piece-goods.

9. *Bombay Native Piece-goods Merchants' Association*, consisting of 337 members representing firms mainly interested in piece-goods.

10. *The Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau*, consisting of 527 members representing firms interested in cotton, yarn, piece-goods, coal, seeds, etc.

Ahmedabad.

1. *The Mill Owners' Association*, consisting of 70 members, representing 75 mills and factories.

Madras.

1. *The Madras Chamber of Commerce*, consisting of 54 ordinary members, representing both individuals and firms interested in raw products coming from upcountry and all classes of imported goods.

2. *The Southern India Chamber of Commerce*, consisting of 240 members representing individuals and firms interested in grains, pulses, indigo, silk, piece-goods, skins and hides, hardware and cotton.

3. *The Madras Trades Association*, consisting of 32 members representing firms and companies mainly interested in goods sold by retail in Madras to upcountry customers or consigned to branches in the mofussil to be sold by retail by the branches.

4. *The Madras Piece-goods Merchants' Association*, consisting of 146 members representing firms dealing in piece-goods.

5. *The Rice, Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association*, consisting of 62 members representing firms dealing in rice, grains of all kinds, common seeds, castor seed, mustard nuts, food-stuffs and sugar.

6. *Rao Bahadur Venkatesh Srinivas Naik*, President of Ranebennur Municipality and Taluqa Local Board.

Mysore.

1. *The Mysore Chamber of Commerce*, consisting of 108 members, representing firms and individuals mainly interested in piece-goods, grain, oils, oil-cakes and bullion.
2. *Mr. Rose*, Manager of the Bank of Mysore.
3. *Mr. Raja Rao*, Claims Agent.
4. *Mr. Venkateshwara Aiyer* of Mysore.
5. *Mr. Noor Muhammad*, Merchant, Bangalore.

Calcutta.

1. *The Bengal National Chamber of Commerce*, consisting of 147 members representing firms and individuals interested in coal, jute, rice, vegetables and other raw products.
2. *The Calcutta Trades Association*, of 80 members representing firms interested in hardware, drapery, furniture, liquors, canned provisions, machinery, leather goods, glassware, jewellery and plated ware, wearing apparel, medicinal goods, toilet requisites, musical instruments, books and printing matter.
3. *The Import Trade Association*, representing firms interested in imports.
4. *The Marwari Association*, consisting of 150 members representing firms and individuals interested in all classes of produce, but specially piece-goods, grains, ghee, seeds and other commodities.
5. *The Bengal Mahajan Sabha*, consisting of 200 members representing firms interested in piece-goods, rice, sugar, salt, jute, spices, hardware, seeds and general merchandise.
6. *The Hatkhola Banijya Hitaishini Sabha*, consisting of 94 members, representing firms interested in jute and grain.
7. *Messrs. Morarji Anandji and Company*, authorised agents of 60 firms doing both export and import business in piece-goods and cotton twist.
8. *The Wine, Spirit and Beer Association*, representing 18 firms in India interested in the liquor trade.
9. *The Tata Iron & Steel Co., Ltd.*, Jamshedpur.

Chittagong.

1. *The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce*, consisting of 20 members representing firms interested in rice, oil, tea garden stores, tea, jute and salt.
2. *The Narayaganj Chamber of Commerce*, consisting of 26 members representing firms interested in jute, coal, cotton, and general cargo.
3. *The Indian Merchants' Association, Chittagong*, consisting of 79 members representing firms and individuals interested in rice, salt, piece-goods, sundry goods, oil, cotton, corrugated iron, etc.
4. *The Chittagong Traders' Association*, consisting of 56 members representing firms and individuals mainly interested in piece-goods, miscellaneous goods and foodstuffs.
5. *Mr. Akshay Kumar Sarkar*, representing the Chittagong College Co-operative Credit Society.

Assam.

1. *Mr. Fox*, representing the Surma Valley Branch of the Indian Tea Association, consisting of 150 members, mainly estates interested in tea and tea garden stores.
2. *Rai Bahadur Promode Chandra Dutta, M.L.C.*
3. *Rai Saheb Manmohan Lahiri, M.L.C.*, Director of a Joint Stock Trading Company, and pleader on behalf of merchants in the Tezpur Sub-division of the Darrang District, Assam.
4. *Khan Bahadur Mohibuddin Ahmed, M.L.C.*, and 5 *Babu Ramani Mohan Dass, M.L.C.*, representing the merchant community of Shillong.
6. *Munshi Reaz Baksh, Merchant, Sylhet*, representing the Sylhet Merchants' Association, consisting of 22 members, representing firms interested in clothes, oilman's stores, shoes and miscellaneous stores.

Benares.

- Mr. B. P. Halder*, Proprietor of the Annapurna Pharmacy, Benares, interested in wines, lamps, stores, medicines, tyres, tubes and motor accessories.
2. *Mr. Mohammad Ikram Khan*, Automobile Specialist.
 3. *Messrs. S. C. Mukherjee and Company*, interested in iron, hardware, paints, timber, coal, lime, building materials, haberdashery and oilman's stores.

4. *Mr. Abhoy Ram Chunilal*, Grain Merchant, Commission Agent and Representative of the Bepari Mandal, an Association interested in grain, oil, sugar and miscellaneous merchandise.

5. *Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammad Siddique*, rice and sugar merchant.

6. *Mr. L. Bisheshwar Pershad*, merchant.

7. *Mr. Murlidhar Kaluram*, grain, salt and sugar merchant.

8. *Mr. Jaydayal Madan Gopal*, cloth merchant.

9. *Mr. S. C. Mullick*, dealer in hardware of all kinds.

10. *Mr. Gauri Shankar Pershad*, Legal Practitioner.

Bihar.

1. *The Bihar Planters' Association*, representing over 70 factories interested in stores, machinery, sugarcane, oils, wood, etc.

2. *Mr. Radha Krishna Jalan*, representing Messrs. Gurmukh Rai Radha Krishna, Merchants, Patna, interested in seeds, grain, sugar, paper, press accessories, ghee, etc.

3. *Babu Debi Prashad Dhandania*, Merchant, Bhagalpur, interested in piece-goods, sugar, ghee, rice, etc.

4. *Messrs. Arthur Butler & Co., Limited*, General Merchants, Muzaffarpur.

Nagpur.

1. *Mr. Akbar Ali Mohammad Ali Hassanji*, representing the Nagpur Merchants' Association, consisting of 85 members mainly interested in cotton yarn, cloth, hardware, glassware, chinaware, oils, cement, toys, stones, cutlery, fruit, timber and grain.

2. *Mr. Sorabji Mehta*, Manager, Empress Mills, Nagpur.

3. *Mr. Hirjeebhoy Hormusjee*, Cotton Agent, Empress Mills, Yeotmal.

4. *Mr. Keekabhai*, representing the firm of Ahmadjeebhoy, General Merchants, Raipur.

5. *Mr. Balakrishna Nathani*, Merchant, Raipur, interested in grain, money-lending business, and also in cloth and other miscellaneous merchandise.

6. *Mr. Mohammad Yakooob*, Merchant, Kampti.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce, consisting of 72 members representing firms mainly interested in piece-goods, yarns and coal.

The Delhi Piece-goods Association, consisting of 101 members representing firms chiefly interested in piece-goods.

The Delhi Hindustani Mercantile Association, consisting of 485 members representing firms interested in piece-goods, cotton, woollen and silk goods, yarns and hosiery and miscellaneous merchandise.

Major Ruell, Commandant, "B" Company, Supply Depot, Ambala, representing the Director of Supplies and Transport, Quartermaster-General's Branch, Army Head-quarters, interested in foodstuffs with the exception of wheat products and grain.

Lahore.

1. *The Amritsar Tea Traders' Association*, consisting of 18 members representing firms interested in tea.

2. *Lala Diwan Chand & Sons*, Merchants, Amritsar, interested in cotton and woollen piece-goods.

3. *The Bar Factory Association*, Lyallpur, consisting of 30 members representing mills interested in the import and export of cotton seeds, wheat flour, oil-cakes and machine stores.

4. *The Layallpur Indian Merchants' Association*, consisting of 85 members representing firms interested in the export and import of ghee, seeds, sugar, oil, grain, kappas and cotton seeds.

5. *The Colony Flour Mill*, Layallpur.

Cawnpore.

1. *The Upper India Chamber of Commerce*, consisting of 79 members representing both firms and individuals interested in every class of goods.

2. *Mr. W. R. Watt*, representing the British India Corporation, Limited, Cawnpore, an amalgamation of six companies interested in wool, piece-goods, leather and engineering requisites.

3. *Mr. A. M. Shaw*, Manager, United Provinces Central Mills, Cawnpore, consisting of 82 members representing firms and individuals interested in piece-goods, gram, spices, oil, hides, cotton and hardware.

4. *Lala Sanwal Das Khanna*, Cloth and General Merchant, Allahabad.

5. *Messrs. Rameshwar Prasad, Kesar Prasad*, Managing Agents, Lucknow Sugar Works, Limited, and Lessees, Allahabad Milling Company, Limited, interested in wheat, flour and atta.

6. *Lala Gopal Das*, representing the Tribeni Desi Sugar Works, Naini, Allahabad.

7. *Messrs. B. N. Rama & Co.*, General Merchants, Allahabad.

8. *Mr. Bhagwant Narain Tandon*, representing the Naini Glass Works, Allahabad.

9. *Mr. S. M. Bose*, Merchant, Cawnpore.

Simla.

Major C. H. Gwynn, Assistant Controller of Contracts, chiefly interested in consignments of flour, atta, bran, rations, biscuits, rice, dhall, gram, barley, oats, maize, linseed oil, paints, petrol, etc.

Question No. 4.—In what classes of consignments are complaints of pilferage, theft or shortage most common? and on what railway?

Bombay.

Messrs. Ralli Brothers stated that thefts and pilferages occurred mostly in food grains. All railways were concerned. Recently a number of cases of theft had been reported in cotton seed consignments, booked from the Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

The Bombay Chamber of Commerce stated that pilferages occurred mostly in foodstuffs, cloth and oils or goods that could be sold easily.

Messrs. Phillips and Company stated that in about 10 per cent. of their consignments pilferages were reported.

The Grain Merchants' Association stated that complaints were common on all railways.

The Bombay Marwari Chamber of Commerce reported that complaints were mostly received in connection with seeds and piece-goods and occasionally in connection with cotton.

The Central India Spinning, Weaving and Manufacturing Company, Limited, of Nagpur, stated that petty pilferages were most common in consignments of twist, on the Bengal Nagpur Railway, Ranchi station being particularly notorious.

Messrs. Tata Sons, Limited, stated that entire bales of cotton yarn and cotton piece-goods were delivered short mostly on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India and Great Indian Peninsula Railways.

The Bombay Native Piece-goods Merchants' Association stated that complaints of pilferage, theft and shortage had recently become common both on Bombay, Baroda and Central India and Great Indian Peninsula Railways.

The Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau stated that complaints of pilferage were common with regard to cotton, yarn, piece-goods, coal, seeds, petrol, fruits, etc. Complaints were received with regard to almost all the railways.

Madras.

The Madras Chamber of Commerce reported that pilferages seemed to be confined mostly to foodstuffs, oilman's stores, etc.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce reported that complaints were most common in indigo, grains, pulses and other articles of food. Complaints were greater in number on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway than on the South Indian Railway probably due to the greater length of the former line. The South Indian Railway, however, seemed to have adopted certain devices to prevent theft and pilfering which had to a certain extent been successful.

The Madras Trades Association was of opinion that foodstuffs, drink and wearing apparel were the favourite objects of pilferage. More cases were reported from the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway than from the South Indian Railway.

The Madras Piece-goods Merchants' Association thought that pilferages, thefts and shortages were common on both lines.

The Rice, Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association found that pilferages, thefts and shortage occurred particularly in grains and pulses on both the railway systems.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce thought that complaints were most common in grains and then in piece-goods.

Calcutta.

The Bengal National Chamber of Commerce stated that complaints were common in every class of consignments.

The Import Trade Association thought that pilferages occurred mostly in small consignments.

The Marwari Association and *the Mahajan Sabha* stated that complaints were common in all classes.

The Hatkhola Banijya Hitaishini Sabha mentioned that complaints were common in connection with jute packed in drums.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce mentioned that complaints were most common in consignments of rice on the Assam Bengal Railway. Very few cases of wholesale removal occurred. It was mostly pilferage that took place.

The Narazanganj Chamber of Commerce mentioned that complaints were most common in bazaar stores, such as fresh fruit in baskets on the Eastern Bengal Railway.

The Indian Merchants' Association, Chittagong, stated that complaints were common from small consignments of food, clothing, piece-goods, sundry goods and other essentials of every day use chiefly on the Assam Bengal Railway.

The Chittagong Traders' Association mentioned that complaints were common in consignments of piece-goods, miscellaneous goods, fruits and foodstuffs on the Assam Bengal, Eastern Bengal and Great Indian Peninsula Railways.

Assam.

The Surma Valley Branch of the Indian Tea Association stated that the most common complaint of pilferage occurred in consignments of rice.

Rai Bahadur Promode Chandra Dutta mentioned that complaints of pilferage, theft and shortage were most common in respect of consignments of fresh fruits, vegetables, oils and ghee on the Assam Bengal and Eastern Bengal Railways.

Rai Saheb Manmohan Lahiri stated that complaints were most common in consignments of fresh fruit and vegetables. It was only in very exceptional cases that such goods were received intact. On account of thefts on the railway, merchants in Shillong preferred to bring goods by steamer direct from Calcutta as the responsibility of the common carriers by water was greater than that of the railways.

Khan Bahadur Mohibuddin Ahmed mentioned that pilferage, etc., was most common in consignments of cloth, shoes and boots.

Munshi Reaz Baksh mentioned that pilferages and thefts were common in all classes of goods on the Assam Bengal Railway.

Benares.

Mr. Halder stated that complaints were most common in consignments of wines, oilman's stores, tubes, etc., on the East Indian, Oudh and Rohilkhand and Great Indian Peninsula Railways. He mentioned an instance of some cases of whisky and wine despatched from Messrs. B. K. Paul and Company, Calcutta, in 1918 which there was no necessity for him to unpack immediately they arrived because he had a large stock in hand. When the consignment was opened a fortnight later in one case of "White Horse" Whisky and one case of Exshaw Brandy the bottles were found filled with water. The same bottles had not been emptied, but bazaar bottles had been substituted. He was unable to make a claim because he had taken the goods on a clear receipt. The cases were wired and sealed and also wrapped in gunny. On receiving the next consignment of 5 cases of White Horse Whisky he sent for the Excise Inspector to accompany him to the Railway Station where he had intended opening the parcel in his presence; but unfortunately he could not be found that evening and he had to take delivery and bring the cases home. The boxes were opened next morning in the presence of the Excise Inspector when it was found that 25 bottles of whisky were filled with water. Recently he had received a case from Spence and Company, Bombay, in which the wiring, sealing and clamping were all done thoroughly, so delivery was taken on a clear receipt. As soon as the cases were opened one was found to be filled with stones. The substitution in his opinion could hardly have happened in a reliable merchant's premises.

Mr. Mohammad Ikram Khan stated that complaints were common in nearly all classes, but specially in goods despatched at owner's risk by the East Indian Railway, Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, Bengal and North-Western Railway and Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Mr. S. C. Mukerjee mentioned that cases of pilfering occurred specially in packed boxes on the East Indian, Great Indian Peninsula, Oudh and Rohilkhand and Bengal and North-Western Railways.

Mr. Abhoy Ram Chuniyal stated that practically everything, i.e., oil, sugar, grain and miscellaneous goods was damaged or pilfered in transit. Whole bags were not often lost

but bags were generally cut open and the contents pilfered. For instance, in a bag containing 2 maunds about 10 seers or so would be removed. He cited a case in which 42 tins of ghee were indented from Agar in Marwar out of which 27 were found filled with cowdung on arrival. He considered the conditions were about the same on all railways.

Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammad Siddique mentioned that complaints were most common in consignments of sugar, on almost all railways.

Mr. Bisheshwar Pershad mentioned that his goods were mainly despatched from Howrah by the East Indian Railway and Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway and his experience was that the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway was better—probably because it was State-managed and greater supervision was exercised upon the staff. He did not feel competent to speak in regard to other railways except the Bengal and North-Western Railway which was the worst of the three railways mentioned.

Mr. S. C. Mullick stated that complaints were common in that class of goods which partook of the nature of common use or daily necessity.

Mr. Gauri Shankar Pershad stated that complaints mostly occurred in connection with consignments of sugar, piece-goods and grain carried on Company Railways such as the East Indian, Great Indian Peninsula and the Bengal and North-Western Railways.

Bihar.

The Bihar Planters' Association stated that complaints were common in connection with all kinds of consignments on both the East Indian Railway and Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. Radha Krishna Jalan mentioned that complaints were common in connection with consignments of grain, liquid substances and sugar. Fresh fruit by passenger train especially on the Bengal and North-Western Railway was also almost always pilfered.

Babu Debi Pershad Dhandania stated that in the case of those goods the price of which had risen since after the war, *viz.*, piece-goods, sugar, ghee, rice, etc., complaints were very common. He dealt generally with the East Indian Railway and Bengal and North-Western Railway. Pilferages were more frequent on the latter.

Nagpur.

Mr. Akbar Ali Mohammad Ali Hassanji stated that complaints were common in consignments of yarn, cloth, grain, hardware, fruits, china and glass-ware, both on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway and Bengal Nagpur Railway.

Mr. Sorabji Mehta stated that petty pilferages were most common in consignments of twist on the Bengal Nagpur Railway, Ranchi Station being particularly notorious, while thefts of full bales or packages occurred occasionally on the Great Indian Peninsula, Madras and Southern-Mahratta, North-Western, East Indian and Bengal and North-Western Railways. He produced two statements giving particulars of recent instances of thefts over the different railways mentioned.

Mr. Heerjeebhoy Hormusjee stated that thefts and shortages were most common in consignments of coal and grain. Shortage of coal was a matter of usual occurrence. Last year in a consignment of two wagons of coal consigned to Hubli there was a shortage of about half the quantity originally consigned, while one of the wagons reached Hubli about 4 months after it was booked. The reasons for such shortage were two: firstly, coal was carried in open wagons which gave facilities to the thieves and, secondly, it had to be transhipped at stations where there was a break of gauge. The remedy was that on arrival at these branch lines, notes of the weight and condition of the goods received from foreign lines should be taken, thus making the other lines responsible for shortages if they themselves were not at fault.

Mr. Keekabhai and Mr. Balkrishna Nathani stated that thefts took place in every kind of consignment on the Bengal Nagpur and Great Indian Peninsula Railways.

Mr. Mohamad Yakub stated that complaints were common in consignments of beer, fresh fruit, stationery, etc., on the Bengal Nagpur and Great Indian Peninsula Railways.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce stated that shortages occurred chiefly in consignments of piece-goods and yarns on the North-Western Railway, Bombay, Baroda and Central India and the East Indian Railway.

The Delhi Piece-goods Association stated that complaints of pilferage, theft and shortage occurred in all classes of consignments and on all railways.

The Delhi Hindustani Mercantile Association stated that complaints occurred generally in all classes of goods, but more especially in cotton and sundries, and were not confined to any particular railway.

Lahore.

The Amritsar Tea Traders' Association stated that complaints of pilferage, shortage and theft were common in almost all classes of consignments and specially in owner's risk consignments and also in those where "Risk Note A" was given. They were common on all railways—particularly on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India and North-Western Railways.

Messrs Diwan Chand & Sons, Amritsar, stated that pilferages generally occurred where goods were packed in wooden cases. Pilferage seldom occurred from pressed bales. Sometimes whole packages were lost in transit. Pilferages and thefts generally occurred at junction stations or transshipment points. Pilferage and theft also occurred at the goods shed and parcel shed where goods were stored for despatch and delivery. Pilferages and thefts occurred mostly on the North-Western Railway and Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway narrow gauge.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyallpur, stated that pilferage, theft and shortage were common in consignments of foodstuffs, coal, oil, wheat, *kappas* and cotton seed. They occurred everywhere but specially at transshipment points and receiving stations on all railways.

The Lyallpur Indian Merchants' Association stated that theft, pilferage and shortage occurred commonly in consignments of foodstuffs, ghee, oil, sugar, wheat jaggery, *chutnies*, piecegoods, haberdashery and fruits.

Sheikh M. Mohamad, Proprietor of the Colony Flour Mill, stated that complaints were most common in consignments of *atta* and flour on the North-Western Railway and Bombay Baroda and Central India Railway.

Cawnpore.

The Upper India Chamber of Commerce stated that complaints were common in all pilferable goods but most common in perishables (*e.g.*, fruit, butter, cheese) yarn, piece-goods and paper.

Mr. Shaw, Manager, United Provinces Central Mills, stated that pilferages, thefts and shortages occurred mostly in consignments of piece-goods, grains, spices and oil. They occurred more or less on all railways, but particularly on the East Indian Railway and North-Western Railway.

Lala Sanwal Das Khanna stated that complaints were common in consignments of valuable and useful articles and occurred on all railways.

Messrs. Rameswar Prasad, Kesar Prasad stated that complaints were common in consignments of wheat, flour and *atta*. Regarding wheat, complaints arose mostly in connection with consignments passing over the Oudh and Rohilkhand and Bengal and North-Western Railways while regarding flour the Great Indian Peninsula and Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways appeared to be mostly concerned.

Messrs. B. N. Rama & Co., stated that complaints of pilferage, theft and shortage were common on all the railways and in all classes of consignments.

Mr. Bhagwant Narain Tandon stated that complaints were common in consignments of any value on all the railways. As far as he was concerned coal, glassware and wood were mostly affected.

Mr. S. M. Bose said that complaints were common in all classes of consignments and on all railways. He had had no complaints in connection with consignments travelling on the East Indian Railway Parcels Expresses.

Simla.

Major Gwynn, Assistant Controller of Contracts, stated that complaints were common in all classes of goods chiefly on the North-Western Railway, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, Great Indian Peninsula Railway and Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

Question No. 5.—Are these consignments mainly sent (1) by passenger train or goods train, (2) at railway risk or owner's risk?

Bombay.

Messrs. Ralli Brothers stated that their consignments were mostly sent by goods train at owner's risk where such rates were in force otherwise at railway risk.

The Bombay Chamber of Commerce stated that the railway risk note was so prohibitive in the case of foodstuffs that no advantage could be taken of it. Consignments were sent mainly by goods train at owner's risk *e.g.*, cotton. Wheat went at railway risk. There were alternative rates for certain kinds of produce.

Messrs. Phillips and Company's consignments were mostly sent by passenger train.

The Grain Merchants' Association stated that merchants were generally unwilling to send their consignments at owner's risk but the railway authorities compelled them under some pretext or other to do so.

The Bombay Marwari Chamber of Commerce stated that consignments were mostly sent by goods train at both risks.

The Central India Spinning Weaving Manufacturing Company, Limited, of Nagpur, stated that consignments were sent by goods train and booked at owner's risk rates to stations for which such rates were available. For local booking over the Great Indian Peninsula Railway there had been no owner's risk rates for twist and piece-goods for the last two years.

Messrs. Tata Sons, Limited, stated that consignments were always sent by goods train and mainly at owner's risk under risk note forms B and H. They were sometimes sent at railway risk.

The Bombay Native Piece-goods Merchants Association said that consignments were mostly sent by goods train.

The Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau said that consignments were mostly sent at owner's risk.

Ahmedabad.

The Mill Owners' Association stated that consignments were sent by goods train and mostly at owner's risk.

Madras.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce stated that goods were generally sent by goods trains at owner's risk mainly on account of the disparity in the two rates. Merchants found it impossible to sell their goods at market rates if consigned at railway risk. They were further prevented from taking consignments at railway risk as the railway officials insisted upon extra secure packing which was not only not necessary but further increased costs.

The Madras Trades Association thought that six times as many packages were sent by goods trains as by passenger train at owner's risk.

The Madras Piece-goods Merchants' Association stated that consignments were mainly sent by goods trains at owner's risk.

The Rice, Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association said that it was customary to choose the owner's risk note instead of the railway risk note as the latter rate was nearly double that of the former. Goods were mostly despatched by goods train.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce stated that consignments were mostly sent by goods train and at owner's risk.

Calcutta.

The Calcutta Trades Association stated that consignments were mainly sent by goods train with the exception of fine goods, medicinal articles and fragile goods which were sent by passenger train. Consignments were booked generally at railway risk; the principal exception was beer in bottle or in cask which invariably went at owner's risk at greatly reduced rates.

The Import Trade Association stated that goods were mostly booked at railway risk.

The Marwari Association and the Bengal Mahajan Sabha mentioned that consignments were sent both by passenger train and goods train and mostly at owner's risk.

The Hatkhola Banijya Hitaishini Sabha stated that consignments were sent chiefly by goods train at railway risk.

Messrs. Murarji Anandji stated that consignments were sent chiefly by goods train at owner's risk.

The Wine Spirit and Beer Association stated that where possible consignments were sent at railway risk.

Mr. Sawday representing the *Tata Iron and Steel Company, Limited, Jamshedpur*, stated that in addition to raw produce and machinery which were despatched by goods train the Company acted as importers for the merchants of Jamshedpur in the way of eatables such as grain, ghee, vegetables and other commodities which were generally consigned by passenger train.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce stated that consignments were sent mostly by goods train at owner's risk under risk note H. The Chamber was of opinion that merchants

trading in rice were bound to book under the owner's risk note owing to the prohibitive rate of the railway risk note.

The Narayanganj Chamber of Commerce mentioned that jute, coal and cotton consignments were sent by goods train and stores by passenger train at both risks.

The Indian Merchants' Association stated that goods were invariably sent at owner's risk. Goods trains had been stopped on the Assam Bengal Railway. There were mixed trains consisting of both passenger carriages and goods wagons.

The Chittagong Traders' Association mentioned that consignments were sent mostly by passenger train at owner's risk and in a few cases at railway risk.

Mr. Akshay Kumar Sarkar observed that when the co-operative society desired to send goods, for instance, furniture at railway risk, they were discouraged. When officers were transferred they booked their furniture, but were not allowed to book at railway risk because they were not polished articles or some other reason. In some cases, the objections of the railway might be reasonable but in many cases they were not. It was the general policy of railway subordinates to prefer to send goods at owner's risk. The society had found by experiment that the price of articles would be less by 25 per cent., if the railway delivered goods properly. For example, they had recently purchased 2 maunds of ghee from Calcutta, which cost Rs. 75 at Calcutta, or Rs. 50 at Chittagong inclusive of freight, that is Rs. 2 per seer. Thus a merchant could with profit sell it at Rs. 2-4-0, but no trader would do so for less than Rs. 2-8-0, or Rs. 2-10 because they suffered loss on the railway.

Assam.

Mr. Fox of the *Surma Valley Branch*, of the *Indian Tea Association* stated that formerly he booked at railway risk paying a higher rate; even then there was a great deal of pilferage, amounting to about 20 per cent., but recently the railway had made good arrangements and although now he was booking at owner's risk pilferage only amounted to about 5 per cent.

Rai Bahadur Promode Chandra Dutt stated that fresh fruit and vegetables were sent by passenger train, and other articles by passenger train or goods train according to the urgency of the consignors.

Rai Saheb M. M. Lahiri mentioned that consignments were sent both by passenger train and goods trains mostly at owner's risk.

Khan Bahadur Mohibuddin Ahmed mentioned that consignments were mostly sent by goods train, generally at owner's risk.

Munshi Reaz Baksh stated that consignments were generally sent by goods train at owner's risk.

Bihar.

The Bihar Planters' Association stated that consignments were sent both by passenger train and goods train. The railway often refused to take goods except at owners' risk and the consignee had to accept delivery without any remedy except through the Courts which was usually not practicable. Provision was made for the risk in accordance with the wording of the Railway Regulations with regard to goods at railway risk. The words "at owner's risk" were an incentive to theft. Railways should accept goods at railway risk charging additional freights if necessary.

Messrs. Gurmukh Rai Radha Krishna, Merchants, Patna, mentioned that goods were mainly sent by goods train at owner's risk. Goods sent at owner's risk were not looked after by the railway in the same way as goods booked at railway risk. Merchants could not afford to send goods at railway risk owing to the prohibitive rates charged.

Babu Debi Pershad Dhandania, Merchant, Bhagalpur, stated that consignments were mainly sent by goods train at owner's risk, risk notes being obtained from the consignors' men on frivolous grounds.

Messrs. Arthur Butler and Company, Limited, Muzaffarpur, stated that thefts and pilferages were extremely prevalent on the Bengal and North-Western Railway, while, to get compensation for such losses necessitated endless reminders and correspondence protracted over many months. By far the greater part of the losses occurred in goods sent at owner's risk and they were of opinion that a large percentage of the subordinate railway staff considered that such goods might be looted with impunity. It was a fallacy to think that goods were sent at owners' risk solely in order to obtain reduced rates of freight. In the majority of cases this was only done because of the practical difficulties imposed by the railway on booking at railway risk. If a perfectly sound cask of cement was tendered the goods clerk would write "liable to breakage and damage", if a sound new bag of lime or fireclay, "bags old and torn, liable to loss", if a consignment of timber scantlings, "insecurely packed liable to loss in transit, etc.," in each case insisting on risk notes being executed and goods being sent at owner's risk. It was impracticable to book such goods in stout packing cases and get them accepted at owner's risk though consignors would readily pay extra freight charges to have them treated with reasonable care in transit—especially during unloading and transhipment operations.

Benares.

Mr. B. P. Haldar mentioned that consignments were sent by both passenger and goods train at railway risk.

Mr. Mohammad Ikram Khan mentioned that consignments were mainly sent by goods train and at owner's risk as the difference in the two rates was about double. On the average it paid him to consign cars at owner's risk rather than at railway risk.

Mr. S. C. Mukerjee stated that consignments were mostly sent by goods train and at both risks, but more generally at owner's risk.

Mr. Abhy Ram Chunilal stated that railway clerks generally forced merchants to send goods at owner's risk if there was the slightest damage done to a bag.

Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammad Siddiqe said that consignments were mainly sent by goods train and generally at owner's risk.

Mr. Murlidhar Koluram stated that for the last 3 or 4 years railway clerks had brought pressure to bear on merchants to send consignments at owner's risk and even if goods were properly packed and in good condition they remarked on the railway receipt that the bags were received in a torn condition or something to the same effect.

Mr. Jay Dayal Madan Gopal mentioned that when goods were booked at railway risk there was practically no pilferage because the railway company was responsible. When booked at owner's risk pilferages frequently occurred because railways had nothing to lose. No actual compulsion was brought to bear on the merchants to send their goods at owner's risk but they were invariably told that if their goods were not so sent they would not be booked.

Mr. S. C. Mullick stated that goods were mainly sent by goods train and at owner's risk.

Mr. Gauri Shankar Pershad agreed.

Nagpur.

The Nagpur Merchants' Association stated that as rates by passenger train were very high, consignments were usually sent by goods train at owner's risk. The loss merchants suffered owing to sending goods at owner's risk was not covered by the difference between owner's risk and railway risk rates. Merchants sent goods at owner's risk because they would be able to sell them at a cheaper rate than those sending at railway risk.

Mr. Sorabji Mitha stated that consignments were sent by goods train and were booked only at owner's risk rates to stations for which such rates were available. For local booking over the Great Indian Peninsula there was no owner's risk rate for twist and piece-goods. Traffic of this description intended for stations on the Great Indian Peninsula railway was booked at railway risk. It paid merchants on the whole to send goods at owner's risk. The difference between the two rates was more than enough to cover losses.

Mr. Heerjeebhoy Hormusjee stated that consignments were generally sent by goods train at owner's risk and in the case of fruit parcels, by passenger train.

Mr. Keekabhai and Mr. Balkrishna Nathani stated that goods were consigned at owner's risk, both by passenger and goods train.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce stated that consignments were mainly sent by goods train and only occasionally by passenger train. If goods were accepted at railway risk this rate was preferred, otherwise they were sent at owner's risk. Recently the railways had been forcing consignors to book at owner's risk. If merchants refused to send at owner's risk the railways refused to book. The railway staff took advantage of small traders in this respect. The refusal to book at railway risk might be due to the whole-hearted devotion of the railway employees to the interests of their employers but probably was done with the idea of avoiding further trouble to themselves. It might also be due to bad packing.

The Delhi Piece-goods Association stated that consignments were mainly sent by goods train and at both risks. Some railways refused to book at railway risk under certain conditions.

The Hindustani Mercantile Association stated that consignments were mainly sent by goods trains, but in urgent cases when goods traffic was closed passenger service was availed of. Consignments were mainly sent at railway risk. In cases where the railway refused to take responsibility merchants had to take the risk themselves. Since November 1920 the railways had ceased booking at railway risk apparently because pilferage was increasing. The refusal to accept goods at railway risk was based on the ground of bad packing.

Major Ruell, stated that he had been despatching supplies at railway risk for the last six months. He had worked out the cost of consignments at both rates which was as follows :—

			Rs.
Cost of consignments at railway risk...	21,900
Cost of same consignments if sent at owner's risk	12,400
			<hr/>
Difference	9,500
			<hr/>
The amount of loss written-off was	23,500

Lahore.

The Tea Traders' Association, Amritsar, stated that consignments were mainly sent by goods train both at railway and owner's risk. Consignments were more often sent at railway risk because when received at owner's risk they were always damaged. Moreover, there was very little difficulty in recovering claims from railways when consignments were booked at railway risk. Traders were able to get alternative rates in all cases. The difference from Calcutta to Amritsar in the two rates was about annas 12-6 in the month, the owner's risk rate being about Rs. 2-0-7 and railway risk rate Rs. 2-13-0, in other words, about 25 per cent.

Lala Dwan Chand, Piecegoods Merchant, Amritsar, stated that consignments were generally sent by goods train at railway risk.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyallpur, stated that consignments were generally sent by goods train at both risks.

The Indian Merchants' Association, Lyallpur, stated that consignments were sent by both goods and passenger trains and at both rates.

Sheikh Mohammad, Managing Proprietor, Colony Flour Mills, Lyallpur, stated that consignments were generally sent by goods train at owner's risk.

Cawnpore.

The Upper India Chamber of Commerce stated that perishables except in the case of large consignments of fruit were sent by passenger train at owner's risk. Other classes of goods went mainly by goods train, more often at railway risk than at owner's risk.

The United Provinces Chamber of Commerce stated that consignments were mainly sent by goods train at owner's risk. They did not think that the difference between the owner's risk and railway risk rates covered losses.

The British India Corporation, Limited, Cawnpore, stated that most of the goods in which the Corporation was interested went by goods train at owner's risk. It paid merchants to send their goods at owner's risk, that is to say, the difference over a long period such as a year between the owner's risk and the railway risk rate was sufficient to cover any losses.

The United Provinces Central Mills, Cawnpore, stated that it depended upon the size and weight of the packages, but consignments were invariably booked by goods trains. Cheaper rates were in all cases desired and therefore most of the goods were booked at owner's risk.

Lala Sanwal Das Khanna, General Merchant, Allahabad, stated that consignments were sent both by goods train and passenger train at owner's risk but mostly at railway risk.

Messrs. Rameshwar Prasad Kesar Prasad stated that consignments were mostly sent by goods train. Wheat was generally sent at railway risk and its products at owner's risk.

The Triteni Desi Sugar Works, Naini, Allahabad, stated that consignments were mostly sent by goods train at owner's risk. They found that it paid to send consignments at owner's risk, because the difference between the two risks was sufficient to cover losses.

Messrs. B. N. Rama and Company, Allahabad, stated that they received and despatched goods by passenger, parcel van and goods train at both owner's risk and railway risk.

The Naini Glass Works, Allahabad, stated that they found it paid to send consignments at owner's risk. If sent at railway risk rates would be increased and competition with foreign goods would not be possible. They preferred to run the risk of losing on one consignment than paying a higher freight on all consignments. It was difficult to get compensation in cases of losses or damage on the owner's risk note and he thought that there should be some rule, for instance, if the consignment was booked at owner's risk, at least half compensation should be paid, otherwise pilferages and thefts could not be checked. They were of opinion that the owner's risk note system should be abolished as unless restrictions were put upon the railway, no good would result. They, however, did not think that the public were prepared to pay the higher rate.

Mr. S. M. Bose, Merchant, Cawnpore, stated that he sent consignments by both passenger and goods trains at both risks.

Simla.

Major Gwynn, Assistant Controller of Contracts, stated that he had found by calculation that it paid to book goods under Risk Note Form B, by Military Credit Note, that is to say, the difference between the amount paid on that note and the railway risk rate was sufficient to cover all losses. On learning that Major Ruell of Ambala in his evidence at Delhi had stated that the Military Credit Note did not pay he stated that Ambala was only a Supply Depot Company and probably despatched in small lots, whereas he booked full wagon loads.

Question No. 6.—Are complaints increasing in number? If so, can any explanation be given?

Bombay.

Messrs. Ralli Brothers stated that cases of thefts seemed to have increased during the last two or three years.

The Bombay Chamber of Commerce did not think complaints were increasing in number.

The Grain Merchants' Association thought that complaints were increasing in number. The explanation was (a) railway companies protected themselves by endorsing incorrect remarks on railway receipts such as "bagging old and torn," "liable to leakage" and compelling consignors to sign owners' risk forms although bagging was new. (b) Goods were often sent in open wagons (c) Want of proper watch over the consignments at the forwarding, receiving and transshipping stations. (d) Negligence at the time of unloading the consignments at receiving stations.

The Bombay Marwari Chamber of Commerce thought that complaints were increasing.

The Central India Spinning, Weaving and Manufacturing Company, Limited, of Nagpur, stated that complaints were increasing and would continue so long as no special measures were taken to prevent them. Some time ago owing to continued representations the Railway and Police adopted rigorous measures with satisfactory results. With the slightest slackening of effort, however, pilferages reasserted themselves. They gave statistics showing that pilferages were frequent in the period September to November 1920, when the Police and Railway relaxed their efforts but had almost vanished again since December 1920 with the adoption of special measures once more.

Messrs. Tata Sons, Limited, said that complaints had increased lately and gave statistics. They were not in a position to give any explanation as the railway never gave details as to how the goods were lost but were of opinion that there was not sufficient Watch and Ward at detention places otherwise heavy bales could not be lost. Railways took refuge behind the risk note even when whole bales were missing.

The Bombay Native Piecegoods Merchants' Association stated that complaints were increasing due to (1) introduction of two forms of receipts, (2) lack of proper supervision by those responsible at various places. The railways disclaimed all liability for pilferage, theft, shortage or entire loss. There should be one uniform rate and the railways should be liable.

Messrs. Phillips and Company stated that complaints were not so numerous as formerly as business was less.

The Bombay Presidency Trades Association stated that complaints were not so frequent as a patent device was now used for packing called "Signode." Messrs. Whiteaway, Laidlaw and Company had adopted this device with success.

The Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau thought that complaints were increasing due to lack of vigilance especially at junctions. Merchants were sometimes compelled to accept goods of inferior quality. Coal was pilfered at the destination station.

Ahmedabad.

The Mill Owners' Association stated that complaints were increasing due to defective administration.

Madras.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that complaints were increasing in number due to the deterioration of the standard of general morale on the part of the railway staff, which was again due to the great temptations they had experienced during the war. The indifference of the railway companies to complaints was another cause.

The Madras Trades Association was of opinion that complaints were increasing, but could give no explanation. Complaints mostly arose in connection with consignments of food stuffs, drink and wearing apparel. The Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway was worse than the South Indian Railway in this respect.

The Madras Piecegoods Merchants' Association said that pilferages were common and were increasing, but the increase might be due to increase in railway trade. There were more cases of pilferage on the South Indian Railway but on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway whole consignments had disappeared.

The Madras Chamber of Commerce said that they had had no complaints officially but had heard of a great number of cases.

The Rice, Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association expressed no definite opinion.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce thought that complaints were increasing on account of want of supervision and control by the railway authorities. They specially mentioned thefts of coal. Half of every consignment was pilfered by women with baskets.

Calcutta.

The Bengal Native Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that the railway staff was to blame for the present state of affairs. Unless the staff connived at these thefts they would not be so frequent. Their representative Babu M. G. Ray mentioned two instances in which he despatched some bags of rice which arrived at their destination full of engine

ashes. If these thefts had been committed by outsiders, they would certainly have removed everything, but the railway knew they would be held responsible for any shortages and so they substituted these bags of engine ashes instead.

The Calcutta Trades Association was of opinion that complaints were increasing in number due to (1) discipline, owing to labour troubles, being at a very low ebb; (2) temptation to steal having increased owing to the high cost of living.

The Import Trade Association thought that complaints were increasing.

The Marwari Association also thought complaints were increasing probably because steps were not being taken to check them.

The Bengal Mahajan Sabha was of the same opinion, and stated that the reason was not far to seek, as actual experience had brought it home to the culprits that they could carry on pilferages and thefts with impunity.

The Hatkhola Banijya Hitavhini Sabha also thought that complaints were increasing, the explanation being that (1) cases were not being reported to the railway authorities or, if reported, were not properly dealt with; (2) low pay of the Indian staff of the railway; (3) allowing the booking of goods at reduced rates under Risk Note Form B.

Messrs. Morarji Anandji also thought that complaints were increasing due to the carelessness of both railway staff and the police.

The Wine Spirit and Beer Association also thought that the complaints were increasing especially during the last 9 months. This state of affairs was due to lack of supervision.

The Tata Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., Jamshedpur, stated that consignments of fruit, fish and vegetables imported by them seldom arrived intact. They doubted whether even 1% of such goods arrived in a satisfactory condition. Consignments came by passenger train, vegetables mainly from Calcutta and Patna, fruit from Nagpur, Bombay and Darjeeling. Matters, however, were no worse than they were.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce did not consider that complaints were increasing. What took place was mostly pilferage and not theft of whole bags. Delivery was not always promptly taken. The more handling there was the more chance of pilferage.

The Narayanganj Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that complaints were increasing due to the higher value of goods and the increased cost of living.

The Indian Merchants' Association mentioned that with increase of traffic, complaints increased which was due to slack supervision on the part of the higher authorities and lenient dealing with persons suspected. The consignor was made to sign Risk Note Form B or H, which exonerated the Railway Company from liability to give proper delivery and also afforded opportunity to commit theft and pilferage. The Risk Note Forms B and H were one-sided and should be so amended that all goods should be carried at railway risk, which would make the railway authorities and their subordinates more alive to their duties and responsibilities, and theft and pilferage would automatically cease. If the risk note were abolished, the railway authorities would punish their subordinates and so no more thefts or pilferages would take place. At present railway risk notes rates were prohibitive.

The Chittagong Traders' Association mentioned that complaints were increasing due to negligence and want of supervision by the officers concerned and active participation by the railway staff. Pilferages and thefts occurred mostly in consignments of piecegoods, fruits and foodstuffs.

Mr. Akshay Kumar Sarkar stated that if the co-operative society could get goods through without loss they could sell 25% cheaper. They had tried with success the plan of booking in the name of a Railway Officer. Railway subordinates knew that there would be no enquiry. The Railway should pay the same attention to complaints as was done in the Postal Department.

Assam.

The Surma Valley Branch of the Indian Tea Association stated that last year that matter was taken up very strongly and the Assam Bengal Railway had since reduced losses which was due to improvements effected. Things were now better looked after. Complaints mostly arose in connection with consignments of rice which were formerly booked at railway risk and even then pilferage amounted to about 20%. Consignments were now being booked at owner's risk and pilferage only amounted to 5%.

Rai Bahadur P. C. Dutt thought that complaints were increasing one explanation being the economic condition of the country combined with the poor pay given to lower ranks of railway servants who could not resist the temptation to supplement their income by tampering with consignments. Pilferages and thefts mostly occurred in consignments of fresh fruit, vegetables and ghee.

Roi Sahab Man Mohan Lahiri said that he was not in a position to say that complaints were increasing, but they were gradually becoming more daring in nature. It paid merchants to bring goods direct by steamer.

Khan Bahadur Mahibuddin Ahmed thought that complaints were increasing, but could offer no explanation except that railway officers did not exercise sufficient control or care.

Munshi Reaz Baksh was of opinion that complaints were increasing owing to the enlistment of dishonest servants in the railway.

Bihar.

Messrs. Gurmukh Rai Radha Kishna, Merchants, Patna, were of opinion that complaints were increasing in number due to lack of supervision and disregard of complaints on the part of railway authorities.

Babu Debi Pershad Dhandania, Merchant, Bhagalpur, was of opinion that complaints were increasing due to (a) high prices of goods; (b) pressure of the railway police in exacting tolls from the railway staff on pain of creating trouble; (c) the same staff being retained at one particular station for a number of years; (d) the goods clerk employing his own men as menials; (e) no proper steps being taken to detect thefts.

Benares.

Mr. B. P. Haldar stated that complaints were increasing and on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway were very common. Before the war there were very few cases but during the war and after cases had multiplied. In all probability he had lost about Rs. 5,000 over his cases.

Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammad Siddique thought that complaints were increasing on account of goods being sent at owner's risk.

Mr. Bisheshwar Pershad mentioned that complaints had been increasing due to the higher cost of living combined with laxity of supervision and control. Consignments of stationery and hosiery suffered most. Pilferage was common on the Bengal and North-Western Railway and East Indian Railway and less on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway which was a State Railway.

Mr. Mohammad Ikram Khan stated that during the last 3 or 4 years complaints had increased.

Three grain merchants of Benares (Murlidhar Kalu Ram, Chunilal and Mohammad Ali) stated that all kinds of goods were pilfered. They consigned at owner's risk and were often made to do so. Whole bags were not often stolen, but bags were slit. That there was theft was clear from the condition of railway employees. These merchants also complained of difficulties placed in their way in the matter of open delivery.

Nagpur.

The Nagpur Merchants Association stated that complaints of thefts and shortages were increasing, due to the rise in prices and the low pay which railway subordinate officials received and also to want of proper supervision.

Mr. Sorabji Mehta stated that complaints of pilferages would continue to increase so long as no special measures were taken to prevent them. Complaints of pilferages over the Bengal Nagpur Railway had been of very long standing and as a result of continued and pressing representations to the Railway, vigorous measures were taken by the Railway and Police with satisfactory results. With the slightest slackening in their efforts pilferages re-asserted themselves and this state of affairs continued intermittently, the evil having so far, not been rooted out completely. From the statement produced it appeared that pilferages were frequent during the period September to November 1920 when special measures were withdrawn and almost vanished again since December 1920 with the adoption of special measures once more.

Mr. Heerjeebhoy Hormusjee stated that complaints were increasing as they were indirectly promoted by not being properly dealt with.

Messrs. Keekabhai and B. Nathani stated that thefts were increasing on account of the impertinence, dishonesty and carelessness of the railway staff.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce stated that complaints were increasing in number and were probably due to want of supervision and the absence of deterrent punishment. Along with complaints of shortage there were also complaints with regard to delay. Repetition and increase in these complaints must be due to slackness of supervision. So far as the Chamber could gather the men who were suspected of thefts remained in the same position year after year and therefore it seemed that no deterrent action was taken to stop pilferages, either by punishing the staff or by removing them. Traffic officials had no time to look after the watch and ward. It was necessary to organize a separate department to deal with them.

The Delhi Piece-goods Association stated that complaints were increasing in number and the explanation apparently lay in the slowness in transit. Transit from Bombay to Delhi and Calcutta to Delhi in ordinary times took 8 to 10 days whereas it now took a fortnight to three

weeks and even longer, the inference being that wagons were left in sidings from which it was easy to pilfer goods probably in collusion with the railway watch and ward.

The Delhi Hindustani Mercantile Association stated that complaints were increasing probably due to (1) higher cost of living, (2) refusal on the part of railways to accept any responsibility, (3) careless handling of goods in transit, transshipment and during loading and unloading, (4) insufficient watch at railway goods sheds, (5) lack of supervision, (6) inattention of officials to public interests.

Lahore.

The President of the Tea Traders' Association, Amritsar, stated that complaints were increasing in number which was due to the negligence of the staff which, with a few honourable exceptions, consisted of low-paid and dishonest men. He alluded to clerks, chowkidars, police constables and others who did not receive a living wage. In these days a clerk could not live properly on Rs. 50. A Sub-Inspector could not live on Rs. 50. He thought that the minimum pay of a Sub-Inspector of Police should be Rs. 125. He paid the clerks employed under him from Rs. 60 to Rs. 80. The system was so defective that no one seemed responsible for anything. It was true that the superior officers imposed fines and debits, but the action taken was not sufficient. The fact was that in the railways the superior officers had not got the influence and power of control that they ought to have. When a complaint was made there was always a great deal of delay in getting matters settled and the result was not always satisfactory. It was a common complaint that officers paid more regard to their subordinates than they did to the public. When he said that no one seemed to be responsible for anything, what he meant was that there should be a very careful system of check at every stage in the transit of goods. At stations he had noticed coolies mishandling goods to such an extent that baskets were broken, but no one seemed to worry.

Lala Dwan Chand and Sons, Piece-goods Merchants, Amritsar, stated that since goods were booked at railway risk complaints had not increased. Pilferage and theft was due to lack of supervision by the police and railway officials which encouraged the low-paid staff and coolies to tamper with goods with impunity. Another cause was the growing cost of living. Complaints arose principally in connection with "smalls" which had to stop at intermediate junctions.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyallpur, stated that complaints were increasing owing of the fact that the station staff discouraged complaints.

The Indian Merchants' Association, Lyallpur, thought that complaints were increasing as the railway did not take any interest in paying their claims or in making any enquiry into losses which encouraged offenders.

Sheikh Mohammad, Managing Proprietor, Colony Flour Mills, Lyallpur, thought that complaints were increasing due to the fact that consignors received no help from the higher authorities.

Cawnpore.

The Upper India Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that complaints were certainly increasing in the case of perishables. In the case of other classes of goods it was difficult to reply definitely as many instances of pilferage were not brought to notice. The feeling, however, was that thefts were increasing and the reason would seem to lie in better organization on the part of the thieves and in delays in transit. The question of organization had been stated definitely by Messrs. Keventer and other members with whom the matter had been discussed. There was collusion between some of the railway staff at the sending station and the thieves somewhere *en route*. Three instances were cited showing considerable organization. (1) On the 24th February the Government Railway Police, Cawnpore, reported the theft of 10 bales of cloth from wagon No. 20999 in the East Indian Railway yard at Cawnpore. It was stated that the theft took place on the 17th February. The stolen bales consisted of one bale of union blankets weighing a maund, 6 bales of blue turbans, weighing 12 maunds 17 seers, another bale weighing 14 seers and 2 bales of red turbans weighing 5 maunds. All these goods were despatched from the Elgin Mills siding on the 15th February and they were stolen from the wagon in which they left the siding. They were intended for distribution to centres as wide apart as Karachi and Lahore. Some of the bales weighed over two maunds each. This theft appeared to show complete organization. The thieves must have had news from the despatching station and the facility with which they had taken away bales weighing over 2 maunds each showed an appalling state of affairs. When this happened in a large and well organized yard such as Cawnpore, it was difficult to know what was happening elsewhere. (2) Another case reported from Hathras also showed a certain amount of organization and brought out the question of delay in transit. One bale of yarn of 13½ counts which lay at the goods shed close to the outward office of the Hathras Killah Station since the 13th January 1920 for despatch to Kalpi was missing from the early morning of the 24th February 1920, although two railway chowkidars at a time (one posted at the very place where the bale had disappeared and the other posted

near the lines somewhere lower down) were on duty for keeping watch there. The railway had been taking these bales over gradually for despatch and one bale which had not been taken over was carefully taken from the centre of the group. There were bales nearer at hand which had been accepted by the railway, but none of these were taken. The railway assumed no responsibility as they had not taken over the bale. The distinguishing feature of the case was that the bale should have been carefully selected from among goods for which the railway was responsible. The owners pointed out that in order to get this bale, the thief must have passed over several other bales. There was nothing particular or specially valuable in this particular bale. (3) On November 1st 1920, three tin-lined cases were despatched from Calcutta by the East Indian Railway and reached the Muir Mills, Cawnpore, on the 23rd November. They were 23 days in transit from Calcutta and one case was completely empty, a large hole having been cut through the case and the tin-lining and the whole contents of the case valued at Rs. 2,376 stolen. There was nothing to call for comment in the state of the wagon. Probably the goods had been handled at Cawnpore junction and again at Cawnpore Collectorganj before they went down the Mill siding. What the Chamber could not understand was why a case which was completely empty and which must have appeared less in weight was delivered to the Mill.

The United Provinces Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that complaints were increasing due to the increased cost of living.

The British India Corporation, Limited, Cawnpore, thought that matters were stationary. There was no doubt that there were more complaints, but they thought this was partly due to increased traffic.

The United Provinces Central Mills, Cawnpore, were of opinion that complaints were increasing due to the increased cost of living.

Lala Sanwal Das Khanna, General Merchant, Allahabad, stated that complaints were increasing due to the inadequate punishments inflicted on offenders caught.

Messrs. Rameshwar Prasad Kesar Prasad stated that there was no particular increase

The Tribeni Desi Sugar Works, Allahabad, thought that complaints were increasing due to the fact that the Railway Company and the Railway Police did not trace thefts.

Messrs. R. N. Rama & Co., Merchants, Allahabad, thought that complaints were increasing. Cases were very cursorily investigated by the Police, who tried to put people off without making complaints. The railway authorities did the same. They had known of instances of men being caught by the superior officers of both departments and no notice being taken of their offence. The officers themselves did not think it beneath them to pilfer fruit, etc., and when their subordinates saw them doing this, they naturally followed their example.

Mr. S. M. Bose, Merchant, Cawnpore, stated that complaints occurred at regular intervals, but he did not think that they had increased in any marked degree.

Simla.

Major Gwynn, Assistant Controller of Contracts, did not think that thefts were increasing.

Question No. 7.—If complaints are common, have you any suggestions as to the measures which should be adopted to give greater security?

Bombay.

The Bombay Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that the present system of sealing wagons afforded no protection. Lead seals should be used. Small up-country stations were not fenced but the larger ones were adequately enclosed and the belief of the Chamber was that no theft could possibly occur from outside unless the people inside were also implicated.

The Bombay Presidency Trades Association suggested that goods yards should be as well lighted and protected as Port Trust warehouses and that wagons should be covered and locked. There should be detectives about at places where thefts were likely and deterrent punishments should be given. A clear receipt as between railways would help to fix responsibility. The railway staff would not weigh before delivery.

The Grain Merchants' Association made the following suggestions:—(a) Consignors should not be pressed to book consignments at owner's risk. Station Masters and Goods Clerks should be instructed not to make unreasonable remarks when consignments were in a sound condition. (b) Proper care should be taken by the railway authorities at the time of unloading consignments. (c) When consignments were booked at owner's risk the "sweepings" of such consignments should be handed over to consignees. (d) A special police staff consisting of honest, straightforward and intelligent men should be deputed to watch goods in railway yards and transshipping stations.

The Central India Spinning, Weaving and Manufacturing Company, Limited, of Nagpur, suggested as temporary palliatives the constant vigilance of the police and the adoption of stern measures at the main goods yards. Thefts in running trains were facilitated by the

present defective system of merely sealing up wagon doors. The evil could be checked to some extent by guarding trains with armed constables. The only efficient remedy, however, lay in the employment of wagons of such design as would prove impregnable to train thieves affording at the same time all existing facilities for the loading and unloading of goods.

Messrs. Tata Sons, Limited, suggested that unless the railways were made to realize their responsibilities as carriers of public goods in spite of Risk Note Form B or H signed by the consignor carelessness was bound to occur. Special inspectors might be appointed to see that the rules in force with regard to loading, sealing, watch and ward, etc., were strictly enforced.

The Bombay Native Piece-goods Merchants' Association suggested the restoration of a uniform rate with one form of risk note. Full responsibility as carriers of goods in regard to shortage, non-deliveries and pilferage of goods should rest with the railways.

The Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau suggested proper watch and check at destination and tranship points and better paid staff.

Ahmedabad.

The Mill Owners' Association stated that goods were placed in the yard but the railway receipt was not given till the next day. If theft took place in the meantime the railway was not responsible. If machinery arrived in a damaged condition the railway said it was not properly packed or that they received it in that condition. Goods were delayed at the delivery end owing to lack of cranes. Casks of bleaching powder and china clay had been received completely broken. The railway should not accept goods unless properly packed. The lighting and fencing of goods yards was inadequate. Sheds were not large enough to receive all the goods offered.

Madras.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce suggested that the system of police watch and ward of property and person as existed on the Nizam's Guaranteed State Railway could be with advantage tried. There the police were responsible for any stealing in the goods sheds. They were of opinion that the goods sheds should be strictly under the vigilance of the police with power to arrest even the railway staff for theft of and for tampering with goods in their custody. The jurisdiction of the Railway Police Superintendent should be confined to a traffic section. Each station on the line should have two constables. Each goods train should be accompanied by at least two constables. Fully loaded wagons should be locked instead of being tied with rope and sealed on paper. The substitution of mud and fat for consignments of ghee and oil had established the fact that the railway staff were concerned in pilferages and thefts. All such substitution could not be done in transit without their connivance. Many stations were poorly lighted and lamps were not lit in order to save oil. Breaches of the rules should be severely punished and men with bad records should not be engaged. The South Indian Railway gave intimation of the arrival of goods and other railways should do the same.

The Rice, Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association considered that the owner's risk note should be abolished and responsibility on the part of the railway subordinates should be insisted upon for goods transported. There should be a regular chain of responsibility from the goods clerk who despatched the goods to the guard who looked after them in the course of transit and the receiving clerk at the destination. It was not an uncommon experience that seals were removed in the absence of the owner and the wagon pilfered and then the wagon re-sealed. Theft-proof wagons hardly existed at present. Secure sheds were wanted at large stations. The receiving clerk should note down shortages.

The Madras Chamber of Commerce thought that if the difference between the owner's risk note and railway risk note could be reduced pilferages and thefts might be minimised as the latter would be more generally availed of.

Rai Bahadur Venkatesh Srinivas Naik was of opinion that when the railway took freight for carrying goods they were morally bound to deliver them to the consignee in the same state in which they were booked which led him to suggest that there should be only one system of booking, namely, at railway risk and the difference in freight should be removed. There should be in his opinion at least two constables at each station and they should be held responsible to a certain extent if thefts or pilferages took place when goods were within the limits of their stations.

The Madras Trades Association representative (Mr. Nicholson of Messrs. Spencer and Company) stated that his firm were doing all they could by cross-battening but suggested on the analogy of their own business that appointments of additional Europeans among the subordinate Railway Police would do good. Some up-country sidings should be better lighted. Sidings sometimes were not fenced at all.

The Madras Piece-goods Merchants' Association stated that locks and seals should be in charge of one responsible official. Seals should be checked every 50 to 100 miles and the officials in charge of trains should be assisted by an adequate number of police who should be held responsible for thefts.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce suggested that if the responsibilities of the railway authorities were increased and the owner's risk note abolished pilferage would be lessened. Gold bullion or rupees should not be placed with ordinary goods even if sent at owner's risk. The present Watch and Ward staff consisted of old and useless men who should be discharged and replaced by retired soldiers and policemen from the Punjab. No casual labour should be employed. A member had informed them that his own men got casual labour in railway sheds and were allowed to pay themselves from the grain they could abstract from the bags. A deposit of rupees five per wagon might be insisted upon when requirements were entered in the Priority Register to be returned if the wagon was duly utilized and to be confiscated if not used.

Calcutta.

The Calcutta Trades Association considered that complaints would be greatly reduced if the transit of goods could be accelerated. They were of opinion that consignments were pilfered while lying in goods sheds awaiting loading into wagons. Delays could only be overcome by providing additional marshalling yards, sidings, etc. A Special Railway Department might be formed to guard consignments in all phases of transit; but it would be necessary to give such a department the same legal powers as the police. If it were not possible to grant such powers, then the Superintendent of Police should be made the head of such Railway Department. Wagons should be more securely fastened. The constant transfer of staff at transhipment stations was necessary.

The Import Trade Association insisted that some sort of receipt should be given for goods when made over to the railway, i. e., between the time the goods were placed in the godowns or yards and until the railway receipt was issued. They observed that the East Indian Railway had a system under which goods might be booked to certain stations on certain days, i. e., nominated bookings.

The Marwari Association thought that the present Risk Note Form was defective and should be so amended as to throw substantial responsibility on the Railway Company even in the case of owner's risk consignments. Goods should be despatched immediately after receipt and goods wagons should not be detained at large junctions for several days. At destination the consignees should be informed by a card or letter as soon as the goods arrived. The place where the goods were kept should be well-guarded and the responsibility should mainly lie with the police.

The Bengal Mahajan Sabha thought that an early and radical amendment of the Indian Railway Act would be the only remedy. The whole liability should be thrown on the railways by abolishing the risk note.

The Marwari Association thought that risk notes were very defective, and was altogether opposed to Risk Note B.

The Hatkhola Baniyya Hitaiskini Sabha stated that the whole staff connected with loading and unloading should be made responsible for making good any loss suffered by consignors and consignees. The pay of the staff should be sufficiently increased to place them above committing such crimes. Local agencies should be started at important stations to deal with cases of theft, pilferage, shortage and loss.

Messrs. Murarji Anandji suggested that the railway staff and police should be made to understand that the carriers could not waive their liability even if consignments were booked at owner's risk covered by Risk Note B or H. Thefts and pilferages were frequent because the staff were under the impression that claims would be repudiated on those grounds. There should be two armed guards to each goods train, one in the middle and the other in the rear.

The Wine, Spirit and Beer Association mentioned that they had noticed that when merchants were able to bring several successful claims in quick succession against the Railway Company it tended to put a stop to thefts and pilferages. They also recommended a more efficient Watch and Ward and better supervision.

The Tata Iron and Steel Company, Limited, Jamshedpur, thought that more might be done by referring cases more frequently to the Police. Railways seemed not to care so long as they were protected against claims. "We think that something might be done if every complaint of theft or robbery were sent to the Police." The calibre of station masters should be improved so that they could put down the iniquities of the station staff. They cited the case of a fish merchant who started with two maunds of fish from Puri but only reached his destination with 30 seers. He had had to distribute the rest along the line. Another man started from Calcutta with 200 chickens and arrived with 45 for the same reason. The baskets were in the guard's van and he had to distribute at every station. Big consignors were more respected than ordinary merchants. The Company had had trouble with ghee but not so much with rice. The Company now loaded its wagons (generally consignments came in full loads) and had no trouble.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that thefts from running trains might occasionally be more fully reported on.

The Narayanganj Chamber of Commerce suggested that the present system of forcing consignors to sign risk notes freed the railway of responsibility to a great extent and the risk note system was abused by the railway staff.

The Indian Merchants' Association was of opinion that there should be more inspecting and supervising officers. The supervising staff should be independent of the Traffic Department and should be recruited from respectable and educated families in the same way as the gazetted officers and they should be directly under the Agent. A system of rewards for detection should be introduced as in the Excise, Police and other departments of the Government. There should be more frequent transfers in the goods and parcel departments. A system of taking security which should be strictly adhered to should be introduced. More effective police arrangements should be made to keep watch and ward over goods and passengers. Guards in charge of trains should be made liable for shortage and pilferage. An improved system of locking or fastening should be introduced. Pilferages and thefts were committed mostly by the railway staff, including the watch and ward. The owner's risk note should be abolished.

The Chittagong Traders' Association suggested that special officers should be appointed to supervise the carriage of goods from the booking stations to the wagons, from wagons to the steamer and from the steamer to the wagons again, and so on till delivery.

Assam.

The Surma Valley Branch of the Indian Tea Association recommended that a small force of the Criminal Investigation Department should be employed to watch foodstuffs from the time of arrival at the goods yard to the time of taking delivery. If the risk note system was altered and the goods were carried at railway risk, pilferages would be diminished by 75 per cent. At present the railway risk rates were prohibitive. Unless the risk note system was abolished and the railway was made responsible, pilferages would not stop. The railway must not be allowed to escape on the slightest technicality.

Rai Bahadur Promode Chandra Dutt suggested that a special staff paid well enough to be above temptation might be entertained to travel about and keep watch. This staff should not be concerned with claims but should simply see that the staff performed their duties. The pay of the subordinate staff should also be substantially increased.

Rai Sahab M. M. Lahiri was of opinion that pilferages were common owing to the risk note system. The risk note shielded the railway against liability and acted as a loophole to their servants to commit theft. The pocket of the railways was hardly touched in case of loss and there was scarcely any check to the dishonest activities of their servants. The remedy was simple. Abolish the system of taking risk notes in regard to goods properly packed and make the railways liable for such goods in transit; then 50 per cent. of the theft would disappear automatically. There should be proper supervision. First information of loss should be treated as a case of theft and should be enquired into at once. This would not stop pilferages but might check them. There should be a special branch of the Criminal Investigation Department for such enquiries.

Khan Bahadur Mahibuddin Ahmed thought that the system of sending goods at owner's risk allowed many loopholes for pilferage by unscrupulous railway servants and that such pilferage might be checked by more careful supervision. Most of the thefts were in his opinion committed by railway menials or with the connivance of railway servants by outsiders.

Munshi Reaz Baksh suggested that a committee of local traders consisting of about 5 members should be appointed in certain localities which should report matters to the Agent. Goods Clerks should be frequently transferred.

Bihar.

The Bihar Planters' Association suggested greater European supervision in order to obtain more tons per mile from each wagon and acceleration of all services. Railways often refused goods except at owner's risk which was an incentive to theft. All goods should be sent at railway risk at enhanced rates if necessary.

Messrs. Gurmukh Rai Radha Krishna thought that railways should be made definitely to recognise their moral responsibility in the case of goods carried at owner's risk and that the credit of a particular Company should be made to depend upon the amount of care taken in this matter by that Railway. They cited the following instances as ways of enforcing these principles on railways:—(a) At transshipment stations no contract should be given for selling "sweepings," which should be put into the bags of the wagon concerned otherwise contractors would try to increase the amount of sweeping and in that way shortages were bound to occur. Handling should not be done so roughly as was the case at present. Guarding of the yards should be more efficient. (b) Goods sheds should be increased in number and made more commodious. (c) The old type of wagons with wooden doors and wooden floors should be replaced as they had openings through which theft was possible by means of bombs and knives. (d) There should be a special staff on every railway to deal with railway thefts, shortages and other claims. The staff should be required to ascertain from prominent merchants from time to time the complaints of the public and the progress made

in redressing them. They had never found any staff enquiring into and remedying the grievances of merchants. Whenever merchants made complaints they were never known to get satisfaction. The claims system was very irregular. Sometimes when a consignment of 500 bags was received and 5 bags were found torn and the consignee asked permission to take delivery of the 495 bags, the railway refused and put pressure on the consignee to take the whole consignment. Merchants sometimes took away their goods without a murmur. It would be an advantage if Traffic Inspectors and District Traffic Superintendents met local merchants and asked them what their grievances were. (e) Railways should be made to give receipts immediately for all goods brought into the station instead of issuing receipts days and even months after the goods were brought in.

Babu Debi Pershad Dhandania suggested that Risk Notes A and B should be abolished. In cases where such risk notes were held the Railway Companies claimed exemption invariably on that ground. (b) Goods after being loaded in wagons should not be detained at the sending station. (c) Wagons should be sealed by the goods clerk or some other officer who should be responsible for the same. Proper care should be taken in sealing which should not be done by menials. The seal should remain with the officer in charge. (d) Wagons should not be detained at junction or transshipment stations but should be attached to and sent off by the next available train. In the case of small consignments great care should be taken in despatching them at the earliest opportunity. (e) Guards should be held more responsible for goods trains. Along with the guard there should be an officer not below the rank of a Sub-Inspector to watch the trains while in motion and while standing at stations. The Railway Police at stations should be made subordinate to such officer who should keep a register for signature by the police at the stations and the taking of such signatures should indicate that the seals of the wagons were intact. The officer should himself sign the register kept at stations as to the condition of the wagons. This work should not take more than 10 minutes. (f) Goods clerks in charge of stations should be transferred every three years and also the officials subordinate to them. The number of chowkidars for night work should be increased. Goods Clerks should send quarterly reports of the conduct of chowkidars to the District Traffic Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent of Police. Any misconduct on their part should be taken into account. The pay of the Watch and Ward staff should be increased. (g) Full load wagons should be locked by padlocks supplied by the consignor if he so desired. (h) Where loaded wagons were unavoidably held up at sidings, at starting stations, *en route*, or at the destination station, the Watch and Ward should be warned specially at night time, by the station staff who should see that they were properly watched. (i) All wagons in goods trains should be provided with strong padlocks; the keys of each should be kept with the guard. (j) The powers of the Railway Police should be limited to cases of breach of the peace, theft and robbery and in all other cases they should be directed not to interfere unless called upon to do so by the responsible railway authorities. (k) Entrance and exit gates should be watched night and day.

Messrs. Arthur Butler & Co., Limited, considered that thefts would be greatly minimised if the railway were compelled to accept goods at railway risk, as their subordinate staff would not then feel that no enquiry would be made in the cases of losses. In the case of goods sent in bulk which were also only accepted at railway risk a limit should be put on the percentage of loss in transit that consignors might be called upon to sustain; such losses seldom occurred except during transshipment at Mokameh Ghat and while a loss of 2 or 3 per cent. was reasonable in the case of coal they had sustained losses extending up to 10 or 15 per cent. and totalling several tons on one or two wagon loads. The railway repudiated such losses, though manifestly due to thefts or misdespatch on the strength of the risk note executed. Their Motor Department had suffered very considerable losses through the theft of tools, accessories, etc., from cars, tractors and implements during transit, all of which the railway refused to meet. These thefts were generally due to such goods being frequently sent in trucks without any covering.

Benares.

Mr. B. P. Halder thought that if railway companies had proper supervision at transshipment stations very few cases would occur.

Mr. Mohammad Ilram Khan thought that if the railway were made responsible for the loss of theft in transit no theft would take place, which led him to suggest the abolition of the owner's risk note. He was prepared to pay the extra railway risk rates.

Mr. S. C. Mukherjee mentioned that the railways always tried to shirk their responsibilities on some technical point. If the railways were made solely liable for all loss or damage in transit, cases would certainly decrease.

Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammad Siddique suggested that goods trains should be speeded up as pilferages probably occurred during the long waits *en route*. He admitted that it paid him on the whole to receive cars at owner's risk but he thought that that rate should be abolished. Also open delivery should be facilitated.

Mr. Bisheshwar Pershad suggested that greater legal liability should devolve upon the railway to compensate aggrieved parties. It was only when the pockets of the Company would be more substantially touched that they would awaken to their sense of responsibility.

to the public. The salaries and prospects of the low-paid staff handling the goods traffic should be improved; exemplary punishment should be dealt out to people found guilty in order to act as a deterrent, mere departmental punishment or a half-hearted punishment would not suffice. If the higher authorities were more accessible to the public greater attention would be paid to complaints. The Railway Police should be strengthened in numbers and attempts should be made to obtain better educated men as they were likely to be more honest than the half-educated men employed in the past. Open delivery should be facilitated. On the Bengal and North-Western Railway it took ten to twelve days to get it but on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway the Inspector came in 5 or 6 hours. On the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway however they insisted on the Inspector being present which was not the case on other railways.

Mr. Gauri Shanker Prasad suggested that Risk Note Forms B and H and others relating to dead stock or goods should be so amended that the railway would be held responsible for loss and shortages to the extent of half the value of goods extracted from a package. Then the railway authorities would be conscious of their responsibilities. Railway servants found, or even suspected of being, responsible for such losses or shortages either by omission or commission should be heavily punished. Baskets of fruit and tins of ghee were often offered for delivery quite empty, in which case also the law as it existed exempted the railway absolutely from any responsibility.

Nagpur.

The Nagpur Merchants' Association suggested that: (a) small consignments should always be loaded in the presence of the railway guard and any breakage or other signs of probable theft and shortage should be noted in the register and countersigned by the railway guard; (b) consignments should always be kept under lock and key and only a responsible person properly paid should be in charge; (c) the goods shed should be sufficiently commodious and properly guarded and lighted.

Mr. Sorabji Mehta stated that as far as petty pilferages were concerned, constant vigilance on the part of the police and the adoption of stern measures at the chief goods yards would tend to give greater security. Thefts from running trains were facilitated to a certain extent by the existing defective system of merely sealing wagon doors. The evil would be checked to some extent if the doors were locked and then sealed. Possibly this locking could be done by means of an automatic vacuum brake from the engine. The guarding of trains by armed constables would also have a salutary effect. These were temporary palliatives. The only efficient remedy lay in the employment of wagons of such designs as would prove impregnable to train thieves, affording at the same time, all existing facilities for the loading and unloading of the goods.

Mr. Beerjeebhoy Hormusjee stated that shortages were due either to theft or leakage. Leakage was to be expected owing to the goods being roughly handled by hamals at the time of loading, transshipment and unloading. Thefts were either committed by regular thieves or, in most cases, by railway servants assisted by the police. Thefts by regular thieves could be stopped by engaging special sepoy under the control of the Station Master for the purpose of watch and ward, while thefts by the other class of thieves could be stopped by strict official supervision and stern dealing with cases detected.

Messrs. Keekabhai and Nathani suggested that the number of inspectors, detective head constables and constables should be increased. Divisional Inspectors should be replaced by Indian Inspectors. The number of officials should be reduced and the number of constables and head constables increased.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce made the following suggestions:—(1) *Ex-military men* should be appointed as chowkidars at goods sheds and junction stations; (2) the Watch and Ward staff should be placed under a police officer; (3) the organization of the Railway Police should be by railway systems and not by provinces. The North-Western Railway for instance ran through 4 or 5 provinces and the Police probably found it inconvenient to transfer a case from one province to another although it was on the same railway. Investigations would be facilitated. The suggestion if adopted would entail the entire remodelling of the Railway Police throughout the country. The Railway Police in that case would also be overstepping provincial boundaries and would have to be imperialized. (4) The Railway Police staff should be transferred more frequently to prevent collusion between them and the station staff. (5) Similarly at stations where losses were frequently reported the traffic staff should be transferred. This suggestion was based on the assumption that the majority of thefts took place with the connivance of the railway staff. (6) Deterrent punishments should be inflicted on those detected, irrespective of the positions held.

The Delhi Piece-goods Association suggested that greater security would be obtained by carrying goods more quickly and also by having an inspector on each goods train who should be held responsible for goods carried in the train.

The Delhi Hindustani Mercantile Association made the following suggestions:—(1) Stricter vigilance over the menial staff. (2) Closer check of stations by the Traffic Audit Department which should make private enquiries from the public occasionally. (3) Better payment of goods staff. (4) Exemplary punishments in the case of proved cases of theft or

The Madras Piece-goods Merchants' Association stated that it was a very common sight to see large quantities of goods lying outside the sheds affording ample facilities to thieves.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce stated that the general opinion was that lighting and fencing on the railways was inadequate. Fencing in itself was not of much importance unless there was good lighting and efficient watch and ward.

Calcutta.

The Bengal National Chamber of Commerce thought that the lighting and fencing arrangements did not much matter when the railways connived at thefts and pilferages.

The Calcutta Presidency Trades Association thought that much improvement could be effected in regard to goods sheds upcountry.

The Marwari Association did not think that either was adequate.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce suggested that improvements might be made at a certain upcountry station.

The Narayanganj Chamber of Commerce thought that generally speaking the arrangements were adequate. In their opinion pilferages would not be affected so much by better lighting and fencing as by better supervision by the railway staff and the police.

The Indian Merchants' Association was of opinion that the arrangements were inadequate. At some stations there was no light within 200 yards of the station on either side. Lamps were only lit at passenger train time and when the train passed they were put out. Goods trains were always left in the dark and people at the station secured opportunities to commit thefts and pilferages and to tamper with seals, etc.

The Chittagong Traders' Association was also of opinion that the arrangements were inadequate.

Assam.

The Surma Valley Branch of the Indian Tea Association did not think that any amount of fencing would stop pilferage.

Rai Bahadur Promode Chandra Dutt did not think that goods stations were adequately lighted and fenced. *Munshi Keaz Baksh* agreed.

Bihar.

The Bihar Planters' Association considered that neither was adequate.

Messrs. Gurmukh Rai Radha Krishna were of opinion that the fencing was not adequate.

Babu Debi Pershad Dhandania stated that station platforms were not lighted when goods trains arrived. They should be properly lighted as in the case of passenger trains. Defects in lighting should be reported by the guards and police officers travelling with the trains and noted in the registers. More adequate lighting of yards and palisade fencing at least 6 feet in height should be provided at every station between the facing points at both ends.

Benares.

Mr. S. C. Mukerjee thought that goods stations were adequately lighted and fenced.

Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammed Siddique did not consider that this was so.

Mr. Bisheshwar Prasad and *Mr. Gauri Shanker Prasad* agreed with *Mr. Siddique*.

Nagpur.

The Nagpur Merchants' Association was of opinion that goods stations were insufficiently lighted and very badly fenced.

Mr. Sorabji Mehta stated that the Nagpur goods yard at present had no fence worth the name and the lighting was very poor. Fencing was, however, being erected. Regarding other stations the yards were not lighted and fenced, the Bengal Nagpur Railway yards being particularly bad in this respect.

Mr. Heerjeebhoy Hormusjee stated that goods stations in most cases were not lighted at all and in other cases were very inadequately lighted, while the fences were quite insufficient and incapable of keeping off thieves. There were no goods sheds at many stations, the goods being allowed to lie in the open giving free scope for looting with impunity.

Messrs. Keekabhai, Nathani and Yakob, agreed that neither was adequate.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce was of opinion and the *Delhi Piece-goods Merchants' Association* and *Delhi Hindusthani Mercantile Association* agreed that goods stations and yards as a rule were not adequately lighted and fenced.

Lahore.

Lala Ratan Chand, O.B.E., President, the Tea Traders' Association, Amritsar, stated that he could say nothing on the subject, but he knew that goods-sheds were not well guarded. He had occasion to make private enquiries once about pilferages at Pathankote Railway Station and learnt that only 2 chowkidars were employed at the godown which meant that only one chowkidar could be present at a time, which was quite insufficient for such a station.

Messrs. Diwan Chand and Sons, Merchants, Amritsar, stated that goods sheds were neither adequately lighted nor properly fenced. In the new goods sheds at Amritsar Fort Station there were 3 Kitson lights, but inside the shed there was only one. The shed was not properly walled in and could not be closed at night. There was no wall enclosing the shed which was therefore practically open to the public.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyallpur, stated that goods stations were not adequately lighted and fenced. Merchants had to make their own arrangements. Oil was supplied by the railway authorities but was misused by the station staff.

The Indian Merchants' Association, Lyallpur, stated that there were no arrangements for lighting or fencing. Merchants had to make their arrangements for lights and for chowkidars.

Sheikh Muhammad, Managing Proprietor, Colony Flour Mills, Lyallpur, stated that goods stations certainly were not adequately lighted or fenced, but pilferages were committed by the railway staff and not by outside thieves.

Cawnpore.

The Upper India Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that roadside stations were insufficiently lighted. The question of fencing and also perhaps of lighting depended on the meaning to be attached to the term "adequate." For instance, the ordinary fence might serve to protect bulky consignments whereas lighter and more valuable goods might be thrown over any fence. The Chamber realized the enormous expenditure that would be entailed in adequately lighting every station, but they felt that they were not sufficiently lighted even for the minimum of requirements at present. They did not know how fencing could be improved. They would, however, like to see something different from the ordinary 3-strand fencing.

The United Provinces Chamber of Commerce thought that both were inadequate.

The British India Corporation, Limited, Cawnpore, expressed the opinion that the bulk of the trouble on the railways occurred at transshipment stations. There were of course a number of running train thefts, but the greater number of thefts occurred at transshipment yards. If there were adequate protection and lighting in these yards the volume of complaints would undoubtedly diminish considerably. Some years ago their representative had occasion to visit Barabanki, an important junction, where it seemed that the poor lighting and fencing constituted a temptation to the people round about. As far as his recollection went, the yard was practically unfenced on one side.

The United Provinces Central Mills, Cawnpore, thought that there was still plenty of room for improvement, particularly in big industrial cities and in general at small stations where there was practically no light.

Lala Sanwal Das Khanna, General Merchant, Allahabad, was of opinion that the fencing of goods stations was insufficient.

Messrs. Rameshwar Prasad Kesar Prasad, Lala Gopal Das, representing Tribeni Desi Sugar Works, Mr. Bhagwant Narain Tandon, representing Naini Glass Works, Allahabad, and Mr. S. M. Bose, Merchant, Cawnpore, were of opinion that goods stations were not adequately lighted and fenced.

Question No. 9.—At what stage do you suspect that pilferages, etc., are generally made?

Bombay.

The Bombay Chamber of Commerce thought that they occurred after the goods had been loaded. They were kept for some time at the station before being sent upcountry. The facts also pointed to inadequate protection of goods in transit.

The Grain Merchants' Association thought that pilferages occurred at transshipment and receiving stations from open wagons.

The Bombay Marwari Chamber of Commerce thought that pilferages were committed at transshipment stations by the railway servants in charge rather than by outsiders. Pilferages also took place from goods loaded in open wagons.

The Central India Spinning, Weaving and Manufacturing Company, Limited of Nagpur. expressed the opinion that petty pilferages were generally confined to particular stations which led to the conclusion that they were committed in the yards of those stations.

Messrs. Tata Sons, Limited, thought that they occurred either in goods yards after the loading of the wagon and before the start of the train or at places where the wagons were detained.

The Bombay Native Piece-goods Merchants' Association thought that they occurred during transit and especially at junctions where wagons were shunted in the railway yards for sorting purposes and also to a certain extent at unloading stations.

The Bombay Presidency Trades' Association thought that pilferages, etc., were committed by the railway staff.

The Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau were of opinion that pilferages were committed at transshipment and junction stations.

Messrs. Ralli Bros. stated that when shortage was found on delivery the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway gave a short certificate on which a claim was made. The Great Indian Peninsula Railway also gave a delivery order in which entry of shortage was made and which enabled a claim to be lodged.

Madras.

The Madras Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that the majority of thefts occurred from running trains in transit but at times of congestion goods were detained for considerable periods at stations and thefts were probably also committed at that time.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce suspected pilferage at every stage, i.e., in the goods shed both at the place of origin and destination, in transit by running trains and during transshipment. The Chamber recommended the locking of wagons and making the Company responsible for shortage or loss in transit.

The Madras Piece-goods Merchants' Association agreed with the Southern India Chamber of Commerce. Goods lay about after being booked. At the delivery station notice of arrival was not given and merchants were sometimes told that goods had not arrived when they really had.

The Madras Trades Association thought that thefts and pilferages probably occurred at transshipment sheds although they had no definite evidence to that effect.

The Rice, Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association could express no definite opinion. Goods were generally loaded in the presence of the owner or his agent, but were then shunted on to sidings. Seals were sometimes removed and it was there that pilferages probably occurred. Then again pilferage was probably committed at transshipment stations and at delivery stations. They had heard of grain being pilfered by cutting the bags which was effected by inserting knives through the boards.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce suspected that pilferages occurred in transshipment yards and during unloading.

Mr. Rose, Manager of the Bank of Mysore, was of opinion that pilferages occurred chiefly in the transshipment shed. Work at this important spot was entrusted to a clerk on small pay and the loading to a gang of regular railway coolies who by damaging bags were enabled to carry away grain scattered on the floor. No casual labourer should be employed by the Railway Company. All railway coolies should wear a distinctive badge on their arms and should be capable of identification by a number. They should be transferred from station to station frequently. No person should be allowed to enter or leave transshipment sheds without a pass issued by the gateman, who should give security for good conduct. Sheds should be constantly patrolled by the Railway Police alone or acting in co-operation with the Watch and Ward staff. The present Watch and Ward staff was unsatisfactory because aged and useless men were enlisted. The railway authorities should endeavour to do without local men for their Watch and Ward and should employ retired soldiers and policemen from the Punjab. The duty of checking the transshipment of goods should be under the charge of better paid and more responsible clerks who should give security and should be transferred annually and should not return to the same post under five years. The Railway Police should arrest any one in the sheds found in possession of property for which he could not give a reasonable explanation and such excuse as "sweepings" or "permission granted by merchants" should not be accepted. Station Masters should not be allowed to interfere with the Railway Police in the execution of their duty.

Mr. Raja Rao, Claims Agent, observed that goods trains at certain stations were detained for hours together to give privilege to a superior train. In such cases the goods train was shunted off to the siding. The guard and the under-guard both went to the station and the wagons were left unsecured for. This was also done at night time. A number of thefts took place when wagons were thus left in the siding.

Calcutta.

The Bengal National Chamber of Commerce thought they generally occurred at the place where consignments were loaded and where they were allowed to lie for some time.

The Calcutta Trades Association thought that pilfering took place—(1) during transit from the merchants' godowns to the goods shed; (2) at the shed awaiting loading into the wagons; (3) in sidings in course of transit; (4) at transshipment stations; and considered that the majority of thefts took place in (3) and (4).

The Import Trade Association was of opinion that pilferages generally occurred at forwarding stations, receiving stations, and transshipping stations.

The Marwari Association thought they occurred between the time of receipt and loading at the starting station and again while loading in the same wagon at another station if the wagon was not full; again at road side stations where wagons were detained for some time, and at the destination station between the time of arrival and delivery. In passenger train consignments, pilferages occurred while the goods were lying in the office of the stationmaster between the time of arrival and delivery.

The Bengal Mahajan Sabha thought that thefts and pilferages occurred while the goods were in the receiving and destination yards and also while in transit.

The Batkhola Benmija Hitarshini Sabha suspected that pilferages were committed at loading stations, transshipment centres and unloading stations. Theft of parcels and luggage from passenger trains were done while the train was running.

The Tata Iron & Steel Co., Ltd., Jamshedpur, expressed no definite opinion but mentioned that they did their own loading and unloading of rice, ghee, etc., in full wagons.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce thought that pilferages generally occurred during transit, during transshipment and at upcountry stations during process of taking delivery. Delivery was not taken directly. The more handling there was the more liable to pilferage consignments were, and the more difficult to trace. For instance, Srimangal was a distributing centre. Rice arrived there in large quantities. It had to be stacked there before it was delivered.

The Narayanganj Chamber of Commerce suggested that pilferages, etc., generally occurred at stations of destination.

The Indian Merchants' Association considered that pilferages occurred mostly at halting stations, where the wagons were detached and detained for a considerable time. They occurred to a less extent at booking and delivery stations.

The Chittagong Traders' Association suspected that pilferages occurred at the time of transshipment; also in the booking office, in godowns, on board the steamer, in running trains and at every station where wagons were unlocked.

Mr. Akshay Kumar Sarkar considered that pilferages took place with regard to large consignments at the sending station and in regard to small consignments during transit and at delivery stations, because large consignments had to remain in the sending station for a considerable time awaiting wagons.

Assam.

Rai Bahadur Promode Chandra Dutt thought that pilferages occurred mostly at transshipment stations at night.

Rai Saheb Manmohan Lahiri was of opinion that thefts were committed both on trains and at transshipment and other stations.

Khan Saheb Mahibuddin Ahmed thought that pilferages took place in the godowns and also in transit.

Babu Ramani Mohan Das was of opinion that most thefts occurred on the steamer.

Munshi Reaz Baksh thought that pilferages mostly occurred at destination stations.

Bihar.

The Bihar Planters' Association said that they appeared to be most frequent at the Ghat and changing stations which were not sufficiently guarded and lighted, but there were constant thefts at all stages of the journey.

Messrs. Gurmukh Rai Radha Krishna were of opinion that pilferages, etc., were committed at the transshipment stage and in railway godowns by railway servants.

Babu Debi Pershad Dhandania stated that thefts and pilferages occurred when goods trains halted on the way beyond the distant signals or at stations at night for a considerable period to allow other trains to pass and also when wagons were detached at stations and kept on the sidings for the night or at starting stations prior to departure. Pilferages also occurred in running trains.

Benares.

Mr. Mohammad Ikram Khan explained verbally by citing cases. He mentioned that recently he had received 2 cars from Howrah which were detained at Moghulserai for 3 days. In the meanwhile somebody must have opened the side-door and removed one spare wheel with tyres. The matter was reported to the railway who said that as the wheel and tyres were not mentioned in the railway receipt they could not entertain any claim nor were they responsible for such shortage because the car was booked at owner's risk. In another case one side lamp was removed in transit and the refusal to accept the case was based on the ground that no special mention was made of the lamp and the car was booked at owner's risk. Again a petrol wagon was kept for about 7 days at Moghulserai without any apparent reason. After 6 or 7 days the railway authorities started removing the petrol from one wagon to another when it was found that the contents of 6 or 7 tins had been removed. The pilferers had emptied the contents and replaced the tins underneath other full tins. This was undoubtedly done by railway employees. As a matter of fact, a number of people worked in the goods shed for nothing. They were allowed to remain there by the Station Master who probably got something. They did the work of loading and unloading and simply lived on pilferages. Although they might not be railway employees still they were contractors' employees and the contractor might be the Goods Clerk or the Station Master.

Mr. S. C. Mukerjee thought that pilferages occurred everywhere from start to finish.

Mr. Abhoy Charan Chuniyal observed that there were sometimes 10 or 12 petty officials at the station and about 50 others working without pay. All that was necessary to show whether the railway people were making capital out of these circumstances was merely to compare the condition of Station Masters and Goods Clerks before and after the war. Goods which remained on the platform often suffered from theft and pilferage. No one could thief without the connivance of the railway staff.

Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammad Siddique mentioned that of the 100 coolies employed at the Benares Station only 10 or 12 were paid and the rest worked without remuneration—obviously earning their living by thieving and pilfering.

Mr. Bisheshwar Prasad was unable to say at what stage pilferages occurred. He received goods from Howrah which took a month to reach Benares. He had to pay demurrage if there was delay in taking delivery of more than three days. He thought it would have a salutary effect if railway authorities were made to pay demurrage in cases where goods were unreasonably delayed in transit. They would never improve matters unless they were made to pay themselves. He suspected that pilferage was common either at the station where the goods were despatched or at the destination station and did not occur on the way except at transshipment stations or where wagons were delayed at some intermediate station.

Mr. Gauri Shanker Prasad thought that pilferages mostly occurred at places where goods were loaded or unloaded or where transshipment occurred. In the case of goods carried in guard's goods vans thefts often took place in running trains, but generally occurred where they had to wait for a van.

Nagpur.

The Nagpur Merchants' Association were of opinion that pilferages and thefts generally took place *en route* and at goods stations.

Mr. Sorabji Mehta stated that petty pilferages were generally confined to particular stations which led to the conclusion that they were committed in the yards of those stations. Thefts of whole packages appeared to be perpetrated between the distant and home signals when trains were not going at full speed or at such places where, owing to gradients or other causes, the speed of the trains had to be decreased.

Mr. Heerjeebhoy Hormusjee was of opinion that pilferages, etc., took place at the time loading, transshipping, and between the time the goods were unloaded and delivered to the owner.

Messrs. Keekabhai and Nathuni stated that thefts of goods despatched by goods trains took place in transit, while parcels sent by passenger train were generally stolen in the parcels office in consultation with the guard.

Mr. Mohamad Yakub thought that pilferages occurred mostly at the time of loading and unloading.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce stated that pilferages, etc., took place at all stages, i.e., at forwarding and destination stations, from running trains, and from standing trains at junction stations.

The Delhi Piece-goods Association thought that pilferages occurred during transit, i.e., when wagons or trains were left in sidings and also during transshipment and whilst the goods were lying about in yards before being booked. It was possible for pilferages to take place on steamers. Thefts at the docks had also become very common. Pilferages also took place on the railway. These last cases could be checked as the packages could be re-weighed and if there was any difference between the weight shewn on the railway receipt drawn up at the docks and the actual weight at Delhi it could be inferred that the pilferage had taken place on

the railway. Owing to the tremendous losses sustained by members of the Association it had been arranged to take out running policies from Insurance Companies. The Insurance Companies would not pay unless the loss or damage was certified by the railways, who however would not render assistance in this respect. Even if open delivery was given and shortages were found, the railways would not help the owners to recover the claim from the Insurance Companies as they absolutely refused to give any certificate.

The Delhi Hindustani Mercantile Association mentioned the following stages where pilferages occurred :—

(a) Goods traffic—

(1) Running trains; (2) thefts at booking stations; (3) at transshipment junctions; (4) at destination; (5) at the docks.

(b) Parcel traffic—

(1) While in the hands of railway coolies and menial staff; (2) while under the supervision of Railway Watch and Ward and Police; (3) while in the brake-van; (4) at destination while awaiting delivery.

Foreign goods had to pass through three different stages—(1) arrival by steamer; (2) landing at the docks; and (3) transit by rail. During their transshipment from steamer to rail a considerable quantity of stuff was pilfered. The Bombay Dock Company should be very careful in handling goods. The Railway did not take any risks and merchants had to suffer the losses.

Lahore.

The Tea Traders' Association, Amritsar, thought that pilferages were generally committed at booking stations, transshipping stations and destination stations. Running train robberies were comparatively few.

Messrs. Diwan Chand & Sons, Piece-goods Merchants, Amritsar, thought that pilferages and thefts generally were committed at junctions or transshipment stations. Pilferages also occurred in the goods shed where goods were stored for despatch or delivery.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyallpur, thought that pilferages, etc., were generally committed at receiving and transshipping stations. Unhooked goods were pilfered at despatching stations, and fruits and parcels on running trains and at goods sheds at the receiving stations.

The Indian Merchants' Association, Lyallpur, agreed.

Sheikh Mohammad, Managing Proprietor, Colony Flour Mills, Lyallpur, thought that pilferages occurred after the arrival of goods at destination stations. Occasionally they were committed at the booking stations.

Cawnpore.

The Upper India Chamber of Commerce stated that thefts seemed to take place at every stage but perhaps the despatching stage, which would include in the case of the Cawnpore Mill siding, distribution at Collectorganj, was the most vulnerable. Delays at transshipment yards en route must lead to thefts.

The British India Corporation, Limited, Cawnpore, stated that the bulk of the trouble occurred at transshipment stations. There were of course a certain number of running train thefts, but the greater number of thefts occurred at transshipment yards.

The United Provinces Central Mills, Cawnpore, were of opinion that pilferages, etc., generally occurred at loading stations, in running trains, at transshipment stations and destination stations.

Lala Sanwal Das Khanna, General Merchant, Allahabad, stated that booking and delivery stations were mostly suspected. In sidings also there were chances as the wagons were not well secured.

Messrs. Rameshwar Prasad Kesar Prasad thought that pilferages occurred at (a) transshipment stations; (b) when wagons were lying in goods yards of large stations; (c) at small stations where there was practically no supervision.

Messrs. B. N. Rama & Co., Merchants, Allahabad, suspected that pilferages, etc., occurred in all trains, all stations and all goods sheds by guards, station masters, railway clerks, loading and unloading staff. No railway servant deputed at a goods shed bought fuel. Eatables were also taken by all railway employees and by the railway police more or less according to their chances.

The Naini Glass Works, Allahabad, were of opinion that pilferages in passenger trains were generally committed by the guard and by the staff of the station receiving the goods or by the staff of the station where goods were transhipped.

Mr. S. M. Bose, Merchant, Cawnpore, stated that the slower the goods train service the greater was the facility for pilferages. The system of shunting of goods trains anywhere for hours together was a great help to the gangs at work. The Police got no chance of co-operating. The receiving and delivery stations could not do much harm unless goods were lying for some time with them. At the former station it was the railway who could help and at the latter station the consignee should be careful.

Question No. 10.—Do you send your own men to book the consignments, see them into the wagon, and take delivery ?

Bombay.

From the evidence of the witnesses it appeared that this procedure was observed as far as practicable. It generally happened that goods were not immediately loaded.

Ahmedabad.

The Mill Owners' Association stated that consignments were generally booked through *marfatias* or carting agents who placed the goods in the yard. The actual loading was done some days later.

Messrs. Ralli Bros. said that their men did so whenever possible. Delivery wagons were placed alongside their own sheds at the depot on the Bombay Port Trust Railway.

The Bombay Native Piece-goods Merchants' Association stated that *mukaddams* were sent to book consignment and merchants' men were deputed to receive them.

Madras.

The Madras Chamber of Commerce stated that merchants generally sent their own employees to book and take delivery.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce said that they sent their own *maistries* to book goods and see them into wagons when possible and also to take delivery, but they were made to pay all charges before being shown the goods. Then again in the case of small consignments the staff at place of origin endorsed on the railway receipt that the goods were insecurely packed or "liable for breakage or shortage" and this was used to prove condition at starting. Again if a few articles showed a shortage merchants were not allowed to leave them behind but were compelled to take delivery of all or none. If they did not take all, the goods were liable to pilferage.

The Rice Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association stated that goods were generally loaded in the presence of the owner or his agent but the railways were in the habit of unloading full wagons without informing merchants.

The Madras Piece-goods Merchants' Association stated that merchants were not generally allowed to inspect goods before giving clear receipt.

The Madras Presidency Trades Association stated that merchants' agents booked consignments, saw them weighed and got railway receipts. They did not actually see consignments into wagons except motors or motor cycles. They also took delivery from the inward goods shed and not from the wagons.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce said that merchants generally sent their own men to book but it was very difficult to see goods into wagons as they were at the mercy of low-paid officials in the allotment of wagons. When merchants sent their men to take delivery from wagons the clerks put all sorts of obstacles in the way. Generally, unloading took place during the absence of the merchants' men. Delivery was given late in the day and merchants had to leave their goods at the station. The public never received information from the railway authorities that their wagons had arrived and were waiting to be unloaded, which again meant that they lay in the yard for some time which provided opportunities for pilferage. Goods were also kept waiting for wagons. The Priority Register should be open to the inspection of the public and should be maintained by a responsible officer.

Calcutta.

The Marwari Association stated that merchants sent their own men. They could not see the consignments into wagons as they were received at the booking office where the railway receipt was given and the man was allowed to go. The consignment was not loaded immediately. Regarding taking delivery merchants sent their men every day to the railway offices as no notice was given of the arrival of goods.

The Bengal National Chamber, the Trades Association, Import Trade Association, Bengal Mahajan Sabha, and The Hatkhola Banijya Hitaishini Sabha agreed.

Messrs. Mraraji Anandji said that it was not possible to observe this practice in most cases.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce stated that this practice was observed.

The Narayanganj Chamber of Commerce stated that they sent men to book consignments and to take delivery but they did not see consignments into wagons as this was not necessary.

The Indian Merchants' Association stated that in the case of full wagons merchants sent their own men but in the case of small consignments, these were generally loaded and unloaded by the railway staff in the absence of the consignor or consignee or of their men. At private sidings the railway company had stopped the practice of sending tally clerks. Goods were therefore put into wagons by merchants with their own men and the wagons were locked. In these cases before railway receipts were granted the goods should be properly checked and tallied by the railway clerks at booking stations instead of writing merely, 'said to contain.'

The Chittagong Traders' Association stated that merchants sent their own men to book consignments and as soon as goods were booked, the duty of merchants ceased and they did not see consignments into wagons, as there was no knowing when the goods would be loaded by the railway authorities.

Assam.

The Surma Valley Branch of the Indian Tea Association stated that wagons were loaded by Messrs. Bullock Brothers who put on their own seals. The arrangement worked well.

Rai Bahadur Promode Chandra Dutt said that this was not done.

Khan Bahadur Mahbuddin Ahmed said that merchants sent their own men to book consignments but they did not see them into wagons.

Babu Ramani Mohan Das mentioned that merchants did not get advice of the arrival of consignments. Consequently delivery was not prompt. Merchants generally sent their own men to take delivery.

Munshi Reaz Baksh stated that merchants sent their own men to book consignments but they could not see them into the wagon as the booking clerk did not deal with them immediately. Merchants' agents generally took delivery at destination.

Bihar.

The Bihar Planters' Association stated that this was the general practice. They desired to point out that merchants' men saw the goods into the wagon only when whole wagon-loads were despatched. In cases of despatch of whole wagon loads pilferages did not generally take place.

Messrs. Gurmukh Rai Radha Krishna stated that merchants' men generally came away after filling in the Forwarding Notes for the goods put into the station. Goods lay there for days and even months before the Bill of Lading was given. No one at the starting station considered himself responsible for the safeguarding of such goods.

Babu Debi Pershad Dhandania stated that this practice was generally observed but merchants' men did not actually see the loading or unloading of the goods. They only saw to the booking and to the taking of delivery as the case might be.

Benares.

Mr. B. P. Halder and Mr. Mohammad Ikram Khan said that this was the practice.

Mr. S. C. Mukerjee said that merchants sent their men to book consignments but it was impossible to see them loaded into wagons owing to scarcity of the same and restricted conditions. It was equally impossible to take delivery from a wagon unless the whole wagon was booked.

Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammad Siddique thought that this practice was observed.

Mr. Bisheshwar Prasad said that this practice was observed. It was not possible in many cases for merchants' men to resort to pilferage even if they intended to do so.

Mr. Gauri Shanker Prasad said that merchants' men were sent to consign and take delivery of goods, but they were not and could not be present when the goods were put into or taken out of wagons.

Nagpur.

The Nagpur Merchants' Association stated that merchants generally sent agents to consign and take delivery of goods, but they were not allowed to be present to see them put into the wagons or to be present at the time of unloading. They were not allowed to make any entries about damage or loss in the case of goods sent at owner's risk, but only in the case of goods sent at railway risk. Merchants never received intimation by postcard of the arrival of goods. If merchants pressed for it on the Bengal Nagpur Railway the clerks would make a note to the effect that the merchant's man had called for the goods.

Mr. Sorabji Mehta stated that this practice was observed. Treatment depended on the staff at the station who sometimes allowed merchants to pass remarks and sometimes did not. When merchants sent their bales to a certain station and the agent there found that something was wrong he would ask for open delivery. The order was that if any defect be found in the package it should be opened and examined and remarks made to that effect in the delivery book, but sometimes open delivery was not given. Delivery of the package had to be taken and then a claim lodged.

Mr. Heerjeebhoy Hormusjee stated that he sent his own men to book consignments but it was most inconvenient to wait till the goods were put into the wagon and the wagon sealed which was all done at the pleasure of the railway servants in charge.

Messrs. Keekabhai and Nathani stated that they sent their servants to book consignments and to take delivery, but not actually to load and unload the bales.

Mr. Mohamad Yakub stated that he sent his own men to book consignments but they did not see them into the wagons.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce stated that merchants sent their men to book consignments but they did not see them loaded into the wagon except when the loading had to be done by the consignor. Merchants also sent their men to take delivery of inward consignments. It was impossible for merchants' men to see the consignments actually loaded into wagons and the Chamber had reason to believe that goods were left lying about in the sheds before loading. Open delivery was allowed but the package had to be seen by the Traffic Inspector before delivery could be obtained.

The Delhi Piecegoods Association stated that some merchants sent their own men to book consignments and to take delivery while others had this work done through clearing agents, as it was not an easy matter to get consignments booked and to obtain the railway receipt on the same day. It was a common complaint that the railway receipts were not prepared on the day on which the goods were received and sometimes goods remained lying there for days together giving rise to pilferage. They suggested that a register should be kept at the gate of all goods stations in which all such goods with full particulars should be noted on their entering the limits of the station and a copy of the same should be given to the man who took such consignments to the station. This would assist in checking whether consignments were despatched in the same order in which they were received and would make railway servants feel some responsibility for their safe custody. The register would be open for inspection and would assure merchants that their goods were booked in rotation.

The Hindustani Mercantile Association stated that this practice was observed and that the members of the Association were satisfied with the staff through whom the consignments were sent to the railway premises. Railway rules did not empower owners or their representatives to see that their goods were placed in the wagons in their presence. Delivery was taken by merchants' men. Merchants should be allowed to inspect consignments at the time of delivery and not when they had already given a clear receipt. At times goods were delivered late in the evening when it was impossible for merchants to clear them. They had therefore to be kept lying at the shed. Next day on inspection merchants found that pilferage had taken place, but they had no redress as they had already given clear receipt.

Lahore.

The Tea Traders Association, Amritsar, stated that they employed *mukaddums* who booked consignments on their behalf and also took delivery. They were not always able to see consignments into wagons. The railway had adopted a system under which they did not book the goods on the same day as accepted, the result being that they were kept lying about for some days which afforded opportunities for thefts and pilferages. They did not grant the railway receipt unless the goods were actually booked, and so were not responsible for such thefts as occurred. It was suggested that the railway should invariably grant railway receipts on the same day as they accepted the goods, or, that they should be responsible for all losses which occurred after the goods entered their premises.

Messrs. Diwan Chand and Sons, Piecegoods Merchants, Amritsar, stated that consignments were booked by their agents. The goods were placed in the wagons by railway employees. Delivery was taken by *mukaddums* employed by the firm. At Amritsar a contractor was engaged by the railway who employed coolies. There was a large number of merchants like himself who did business on a large scale, but were ignorant of English and naturally had to take things on trust from the clerks. They did not really understand the conditions of liability and the railways were reducing their liability all round with the result that thefts took place. The system of employing contractors had been enforced for the last 25 years. At the time of taking delivery at the parcel shed the railway staff did not allow merchants to inspect their goods. There was no delivery book in which they could make remarks, nor were they allowed to make remarks on the railway receipt itself. The particulars filled in in railway receipts were in very bad handwriting which it was impossible for merchants to understand. It would be more advantageous if particulars were typed or written in legible writing. It often happened that merchants did not get the railway receipt for goods until several days had elapsed. In the meanwhile the goods lay in the sheds and during this period the railway refused all liability.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyallpur, stated that they sent their own men to book consignments. They pointed out the goods for despatch and waited there until they were loaded. The railway staff worked at their own convenience so that the representative of the firm could not actually see the goods into the wagon which were left entirely at the mercy of the railway staff and the contractors' coolies.

The Indian Merchants' Association, Lyallpur, stated that their agents took delivery and pointed out the goods for despatch. As the railway staff loaded the wagons at their convenience their agents could not possibly see the goods into the wagons. This duty rested upon the railway staff and on the contractors' coolies.

Sheikh Muhammad, Managing Proprietor, Colony Flour Mills, Lyallpur, stated that he sent his own men who dealt with the matter with great care.

Cawnpore.

The Upper India Chamber of Commerce stated that at mill sidings all goods were booked under the direct supervision of the despatcher's clerks and were also loaded under supervision. At other stations the goods were tendered for despatch but the loading was not actually seen by the despatcher's servants. In Cawnpore the system of booking through brokers was widely used. Delivery was either taken through brokers or by the consignee's servants. The brokers did not assume any responsibility. They merely received the goods and the consignment notes and sent the goods off as best as they could.

The United Provinces Central Mills and the Tribeni Desi Sugar Works said that they sent their own men to book consignments, see them into the wagon and take delivery.

Lala Sanwal Das Khanna, the Naini Glass Works, Allahabad, Messrs. B. N. Rama & Co., and Mr. S. M. Bose stated that they sent men to book and take delivery but they were not able to see the goods into or out of the wagons except in the case of full wagon loads.

Messrs. Rameshwar Prasad Kesar Prasad stated that consignments were made over personally, but merchants could not supervise loading as they often lay for several days at stations before a wagon was obtained.

Simla.

Major Gwynn, Assistant Controller of Contracts, stated that he sent his own men to book consignments, see them into the wagons and take delivery.

Question No. 11.—Have you any complaints about specific malpractices, e.g., pressure brought to give clear receipt without examination of goods, etc.

Bombay.

The Bombay Marwari Chamber of Commerce stated that pressure was brought to give clear receipt without examination of goods, etc. Merchants had to agree to these terms to carry out contracts in hand. If they did not, consignments would be delayed. Many members also complained that booking clerks compelled the payment of annas 2 to 4 per ticket.

Messrs. Tata Sons, Limited, stated that railway clerks often made remarks on railway receipts such as "defect in packing," "railway not liable for contents," "bales wet," etc., without justification.

The Bombay Chamber of Commerce stated that they had heard of payments made for supplying wagons.

Madras.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce stated that *maistries* were only shown to the wagons when the charges were paid and on the production of delivery and gate passes. The railway staff at the place of origin were in the habit of endorsing on the railway receipt that the consignments were loosely and insecurely packed so that when taking delivery at the other end the *maistry* would be told that the consignment was in that condition at the time of booking. Again, the staff declined to deliver the whole consignment even though shortages of thefts were detected in a portion of the consignment only. The railway staff sold wagons. The Priority Register should be kept public. At present the station staff concealed the fact that wagons intended for a particular person had arrived and gave them to someone else.

The Rice, Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association stated that the railway staff almost invariably attributed pilferage, shortage or loss to thefts from running trains, but the Association was of opinion that there were less chances of thefts during the running of trains than during the time of halt at stations. Payment to the railway staff for wagons was a recognized practice. During the war Rs. 200 used to be paid for a wagon. Merchants could not inform the Police without getting into trouble themselves. Clear receipts were always demanded. At the time of delivery payment of money to the clerk to obtain his signature was necessary. In the case of the Priority Register whoever paid the highest amount secured the wagon.

Rao Bahadur Venkatesh Srinivas Nark was of opinion that even station masters and guards in charge of trains resorted to pilfering, thus setting an example to the menials under them.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce stated that merchants were obliged to sign in the books as having received delivery before actually taking delivery. Pilfered bags were put in the middle of a consignment so that merchants could not see them and the clerks would not allow merchants to make any remarks saying that they would wire and get it put right. The railway staff always said that there was a shortage of wagons but there was no trouble if something was paid to the goods clerk.

Mr. Rose, Manager of the Bank of Mysore, said that it was urged that merchants were themselves to blame for the corruption that existed on railways. *Prima facie* the argument was no doubt good, but it should be remembered that a merchant had no redress if his requirements were not satisfied; even if they succeeded once in obtaining their demands through the agency of the District Traffic Superintendent they would be marked men in the eyes of goods department and their future chances of securing a wagon would be made more difficult than ever. Instance:—

A Bangalore merchant purchased ground-nuts at X station and instructed the seller to consign the goods to a particular destination. He replied that no wagons were available and that the goods were being exposed to rain and loss at his risk; the purchaser proceeded to X station in the hope of persuading the goods clerk there to give the wagons. He failed and so referred to the station master at Y station. He continued his journey there and was advised by this particular official to 'adjust' with the station master where the goods were lying. He objected to 'adjusting' and was then given an order to the station master at X station to give wagons 'in order.' He waited a fortnight or so for the wagons and found his turn for wagons no nearer; so he decided to close the matter and adjust with the station master. Apart from the payment for wagons merchants were compelled to pay 'mamool' on every bag which ranged from Re. 0-1-3 upwards.

The giving of wagons should be in the hands of the Chief Goods Inspector only who should maintain a register and enter all applications for wagons himself, charging a fee of Rs. 5 for each wagon supplied or granted which amount would be confiscated if the wagons were not utilised. The fact that pilfering and other malpractices could be stopped had been proved in the case of the recent transfer to a certain station of a station master whose pay was said to have been substantially raised and of whose honesty merchants were now fully convinced by an almost complete absence of thefts and complaints of scarcity of wagons.

Calcutta.

The Bengal National Chamber of Commerce stated that railway clerks generally did not give delivery until clear receipt was signed. Merchants were not allowed to enter anything on the railway receipt or even in the register. First, delivery had to be taken and then the railway company had to be addressed.

The Calcutta Trades Association mentioned that open delivery was frequently refused when cases did not show signs of having been pilfered although there might be a deficiency in weight which was attributed by the railway to difference in scales. They suggested that there should be a periodical Government inspection of weighing machines and that open delivery should never be refused by the railway on the plea of a difference in scales.

The Marwari Association said that pressure was brought to give a clear receipt and obstacles were placed in the way of examining goods. Difference in the scales was also utilized as an excuse. The station staff at a certain station had made it a rule to charge 5 annas per maund privately without which payment no wagon could be obtained.

The Hatkhola Baniya Hitarshini Sabha said that pressure was brought to give clear receipts whether goods were examined or not. Station masters generally insisted on inserting in railway receipts a clause such as "drums or bales loosely tied" and "sacks torn." This practice was resorted to to secure the station staff and also the railway against any loss.

Messrs. Morarji Anandji mentioned that the staff at the station of destination generally pressed merchants to give clear receipts in cases of pilferage by pointing out that risk note B or H was held.

The Tata Iron and Steel Company, Limited, Jamshedpur, stated that if a claim could be resisted on a technical ground it received less attention than it should. The railways did not pay enough attention to the criminal aspect of the cases. Possibly the Claims Branch could be made more independent of the Traffic Department. There were no complaints regarding delay in settlement. Merchants did not claim because they knew that they would get nothing and also because things could not be identified. They accepted their losses as a part of the ordinary risks of railway traffic.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce and the Narayanganj Chamber of Commerce had no complaints.

The Indian Merchants' Association stated that without payment of gratification difficulties and delays were caused to merchants both in booking and delivery. Clear receipt was insisted upon before delivery. At the time of the boom in Burma rice traffic in previous years, gratifications to the extent of Rs. 250 and upwards per wagon were known to have been paid to the station staff. The officers concerned with the supplying of wagons from the highest to the lowest had to be satisfied. The Association had had bitter experience in this matter. Even the points jamadar had to be satisfied, otherwise he would not bring the wagon to the siding according to the requirements of merchants.

The Chittagong Traders' Association mentioned that clear receipt was always taken before delivery. The clerks at the time of booking and giving delivery in almost all cases took gratifications. This was specially noticeable at the time of issuing tickets to passengers. The clerks did not begin to issue in due time, but started just a few minutes before the arrival of the train and thereby put passengers to confusion.

Mr. Akshay Kumar Sarkar mentioned that at the booking office in Howrah ladies were employed who could not work quickly. There were frequent complaints that the balance due to purchasers was not returned. They never gave more money to people than they should, which did not show that they were deficient in accounts. If a complaint were lodged in the railway attempts were made to avoid an enquiry. In the Postal Department, as soon as a complaint was made, the postal authorities at once enquired, so that the postal subordinates knew that in case of any complaint, there would be a proper enquiry. In the case of railway subordinates, they knew that very probably there would be no enquiry in consequence of a complaint. There were many opportunities in village post offices to take tips in connection with money orders but no postal subordinate, though he was ill-paid, dared to take it because the authorities were bent upon stopping malpractices. The railway staff made consignors book at owner's risk, e.g., they would not let them send furniture at railway risk if it was not properly polished.

Assam.

The Surma Valley Branch of the Indian Tea Association stated that station masters earned a good deal for securing wagons. Entries were made in Estate Account Books of the amount given to station masters.

Rai Sahib Manmohan Lahiri mentioned that he had no experience about pressure being brought to give clear receipt without examination of goods at railway stations but Steamer Companies working in connection with Railways were notorious in this respect.

Khan Bahadur Mahibuddin Ahmed stated that station masters always asked for clear receipts before delivery and did not give open delivery when consignees suspected anything wrong. In such cases they referred the party to the District Traffic Superintendent who lived far away from the station.

Munshi Reaz Baksh agreed.

Bihar.

The Bihar Planters' Association stated that the practice of the Railway Company was to refuse delivery if remarks were made on the railway receipt. At the same time they threatened demurrage if delivery was not taken. This practice was largely due to fines levied on goods clerks.

Messrs. Gurmukh Rai Radha Krishna stated that pressure was brought to bear upon consignees to take goods, even if damaged, on clear receipts and if objection was made difficulties were raised and delay was sometimes so great that consignors had to suffer serious losses.

Babu Debi Pershad Dhandania stated that the station staff did demand clear receipts, but this practice was gradually being discontinued.

Benares.

Mr. Mohammad Ikram Khan stated that pressure was brought to bear on merchants to give clear receipts without examination of the goods. The station master was not empowered to give open delivery which could only be done by the Traffic Inspector. Open delivery did not mean that merchants would get their claim settled. The railway might repudiate a claim even if it were booked at railway risk.

Mr. S. C. Mukerjee had no such experience.

Mr. S. C. Mullick agreed with *Mr. Mohammad Ikram Khan*. He referred to a consignment of galvanised iron in which one or two sheets were missing from each bundle. The matter was referred to the consignor who said that every bundle contained 12 sheets. The Railway Company refused to record this shortage on the railway receipt.

Mr. Abhoy Ram Chunilal stated that merchants' men were compelled to sign receipts without even examining the goods properly, or even counting the number of packages, within the time that was allowed. When goods came at railway risk on the Bengal and North-Western Railway and a shortage was detected and the merchants asked for open

delivery the goods clerk told them that open delivery could not be given until the District Traffic Superintendent had been informed and the Traffic Inspector had arrived. This very often entailed the delay of many days. The goods clerk informed the merchants that if they wished to take away the goods they could do so at their own risk and this was often done for fear that pilferage should continue.

Mr. Bisheshwar Prasad said that on the Bengal and North-Western Railway when open delivery was asked for the Inspector took 10 or 12 days to come whereas on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway the Inspector arrived within 5 or 6 hours. It was with the greatest difficulty that the clerks in charge at the receiving stations consented to an examination of goods and from his own experience he could say that at times his goods had had to lie at a station for months because he had declined to give clear receipt and it was only after endless correspondence that he was able to take delivery of the goods. In cases where open delivery was demanded the clerks in charge sent slips to the police to be present at the examination, but on an average 3 or 4 hours elapsed before the police arrived—at times even a whole day.

Mr. Gauri Shanker Prasad stated that in a number of cases he had learnt that clear receipts were insisted upon before delivery.

Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammad Siddique stated that it was well known that bribes had to be paid to station masters for wagons and the style in which the railway staff lived testified to this fact.

Nagpur.

The Nagpur Merchants' Association stated that complaints were numerous and thought that the less said about them the better under present arrangements. Merchants had to give something to everybody both when booking and when taking delivery of consignments. In the case of small shortages railway subordinates asked merchants not to press their claims. He had personal knowledge of these matters.

Mr. Sorabji Mehta stated that occasional instances had been known in which, in spite of packages showing signs of having been tampered with, open delivery was refused. Such matters were, however, set right by the proper authorities immediately on a representation being made to them. He had no complaints to make about malpractices. He had no ground for thinking that there was anything in the accusation that big firms, such as the Fimpress Mills, or Ralli Brothers did not experience difficulties as the railway subordinates were frightened of them and that they only preyed on the smaller merchants. It was possible, however, for railway servants to distinguish packages belonging to big firms as their marks were on them.

Mr. Hormusjee stated that he had experienced complaints similar to those mentioned in the question.

Messrs. Keekabhai and Nathani had no remarks to offer.

Mr. Mohamad Yakub stated that he had complaints, but made no mention of specific instances.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce stated that there were numerous and repeated complaints about malpractices such as payments for wagons and also payments at the time of delivery. Payments were made by most of the firms or at any rate their brokers, but big firms like Ralli Brothers and Iatas did not pay. Brokers did not get the money from the merchants but paid out of their own pockets. Malpractices at the time of delivery did not exist to the same extent as at the time of despatching goods. It often happened that when wagons arrived merchants were informed that the platform was closed and that the wagon was lying about half a mile down the line. On payment of a small tip to the station master the wagon would be brought to the platform. The small bazar dealers suffered the most.

The Delhi Piece-goods Association stated that pressure was brought to give clear receipt. Pilferage had developed into an art. It was not easy to detect it in every case and thus there was all the greater necessity for open delivery in case of the slightest suspicion by the consignee or his agent. Open delivery should also be given in the case of goods at owner's risk as it would show the owner how to proceed and the railway authorities would have the opportunity of acquiring knowledge of pilferages. When a shortage was found it should be certified by the goods clerk. There were complaints that there was a good deal of favouritism and that there was a certain amount of buying of wagons.

The Delhi Hindusthani Mercantile Association stated that complaints against malpractices were not rare. There were many reasons to account for the fact that in certain cases consignees were obliged to give clear receipts without examination. Loading and unloading contracts should be given to the public and not to railway officials. Station masters often engaged men of bad character and did not pay them sufficiently with the result that pilferages occurred. The Railway Company itself should preferably make arrangements for loading and unloading and some responsible man should be placed in charge. Goods clerks and other members of the ministerial staff should not be allowed to remain permanently at one place but should be transferred periodically.

Lahore.

The Tea Traders' Association, Amritsar, stated that no complaints of the railway staff bringing pressure to give clear receipt without examining the goods had come to their notice. Remarks to the effect that "inner planks of the chest are broken" or "packing defective" were very often wrongly noted on the railway receipt.

Messrs. Diwan Chand and Sons, Piecegoods Merchants, Amritsar, stated that goods were not despatched according to the order in which the railway receipts were issued and preference was given to those who cultivated the favour of the railway staff. Sometimes wrong remarks were made on railway receipts such as "not in good condition" thus prejudicing claims. At parcel sheds receipts were taken before delivery was given and even when the condition of parcels was unsatisfactory no remark was permitted to be made.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyallpur, stated that the railway staff insisted upon clear receipts being given even in case of shortages.

The Indian Merchants' Association and Sheikh Muhammad, Managing Proprietor, Colony Flour Mills, Lyallpur, agreed.

Cawnpore.

The Upper India Chamber of Commerce stated that complaints had been received from members that station masters declined to permit reweighment. It had not however been made clear that the consignments involved were booked at railway risk. It was understood that on the East Indian Railway even if consignments were booked at owner's risk, the railway encouraged and permitted reweighment. On the other lines it was understood that it was not either permitted or encouraged. Even if bags were slack so long as the whole package was not missing, the other railways would not be bothered because they were completely protected under the risk note. The Lucknow Paper Mills had made a definite statement on the subject to the Chamber. They said "Consignees frequently complain that the Station Master at the receiving station did not allow them to note shortages, nor did he permit reweighment of consignment. In the absence of such procedure no proper steps could be taken to prevent pilferages. Instances have been known where bundles of paper had been tampered with and reams taken out. Such pilferages can only be detected if consignments are permitted to be reweighed at the time of delivery at destination. The result is that whenever a claim is put in it is rejected on the strength that delivery was taken under clear receipt or on the basis of owner's risk." As to whether a procedure of that sort was more frequently imposed on small people than on big firms, the Chamber could only reply by stating that they knew that it was so, but they had no reasons for their knowledge.

The United Provinces Central Mills cited the case of a consignment of 792 tins of mustard oil, 80 tins of which were received quite empty. Their representative endeavoured to show the authorities holes made by nails to extract oil, but he was compelled to effect delivery. The claim was not entertained on the plea that a clear receipt was signed for.

Lala Sanwal Das Khanna stated that he had no complaints about any specific malpractices, but he knew that at times attempts were made to evade open delivery.

Mr. S. M. Boss, Merchant, Cawnpore, stated that merchants' servants who went to take delivery were easily dominated by the goods and parcels clerks, who often succeeded in eliminating causes of suspicion. Even a junior guard or clerk knew how to break a seal and then replace it and they could guess weights. Recently he had to receive a consignment of 8 locks but when the parcel was opened, there were 4 locks and some ballast. The weight of the parcel was undisturbed.

Messrs. Rameshwar Prasad Kesar Prasad stated that the railway invariably required clear receipts on consignments booked at owner's risk. The Bengal and North-Western Railway were particular offenders in this respect. He suggested a cleansing of the railway administration in respect of their receiving and despatching subordinate clerks who demanded gratifications to do what was their ordinary duty. This was particularly the case at small stations where the sale of wagons was a recognized practice. The fact was more or less known to the superior railway staff, who, however, were apparently powerless to deal with the abuse. It was difficult to quote particular cases as the provisions of the Indian Penal Code were rather drastic on the point, the person paying the gratification being as criminally liable as the person receiving it so that, if there was urgent need for a wagon, and it could not be obtained without a bribe, the money was quietly paid and nothing further was said.

Messrs. B. N. Rama and Company had noticed that railway officials generally objected to reweighment of goods.

Question No. 12.—Have you any suggestions to make about the arrangements for the safety of passengers?

Bombay.

The Bombay Marwari Chamber of Commerce suggested that at least five police sepoy should always travel in each passenger train. 3rd class passengers were unable to look

after their luggage when carriages contained more passengers than they were capable of carrying.

The Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau said that proper police supervision was required on all running trains but care should be taken that the men placed on duty were specially selected as otherwise the remedy might prove worse than the disease. Female guards should be posted in female compartments. The emergency chains should be kept in order and frequently tested. Removable foot-boards should be attached to female compartments. The lighting was often defective and facilitated thefts.

The Bombay Native Piecegoods Merchants' Association was of opinion that more police protection was required especially at night time when passengers had to wait for trains.

Madras.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that the existence of travelling police patrols did help to some extent to secure passengers against robbery and theft, but it was absolutely necessary that the travelling force should be armed. Corridor trains should be abolished as they tended towards congestion and facilitated thieving. The police must be vested with some amount of discretion in preventing the over-crowding of passengers in compartments.

The Rice Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association was also of opinion that overcrowding should be prevented and the travelling police should not be confined to the same compartment throughout the journey but should move from carriage to carriage.

The Madras Piecegoods Merchants' Association stated that the police did not give adequate protection to the property of 3rd class passengers at stations. The force should be increased and both sides of trains should be watched.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce suggested that Railway Police constables who generally travelled in passenger trains should invariably get down on to the platform and change compartments and not remain in the same compartment for the whole journey. They should watch the off-sides of trains.

Calcutta.

The Marwari Association suggested that all passenger trains should be composed of corridor carriages as in the Darjeeling Mail.

The Bengal Mahajan Sabha suggested the attachment of guardians' compartment to each compartment reserved for inter and third class ladies with communicating doors, and that only one guardian should be permitted for each female or group as the case might be. The system was in force in the Eastern Bengal Railway and there was no reason why it should not work on all other railways also.

The Hatkhola Banijya Hetaishini Sabha mentioned that there were insufficient ticket windows at important railway stations.

Messrs. Murooji Anandji suggested that in the *zenana* compartment the doors should be locked from inside and Travelling Lady Ticket Inspectors should be appointed.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce and the Narayanganj Chamber of Commerce had no suggestions to make.

The Indian Merchants' Association suggested that doors in 3rd class carriages should open inwards as in 1st and 2nd class compartments. For the safety of female passengers, there should be a compartment attached to female compartments reserved for the ladies' attendants. There should be raised platforms more especially where the rush of passengers was unusually great. There should also be overbridges and double platforms where passengers had to cross the line and also where the main thoroughfare lay across the railway line. Police arrangements on the railway station should be more effective.

The Chittagong Traders' Association suggested that there ought to be more accommodation for 3rd and inter class passengers. There should be water supply and privy in each compartment and there should be waiting rooms in every important station. Trains should be fitted with corridor carriages for the safety of female passengers travelling with their relations. During the night stations should be patrolled as soon as a train arrived. The police were never found helping passengers on the platform even when in any trouble.

Mr. Akshay Kumar Sarkar mentioned that there were complaints about pilgrim traffic, but these were exceptional circumstances. There was not so much overcrowding now as previously.

Assam.

Rui Bahadur Promode Chandra Dutt mentioned that there should be a female guard to attend to women travelling III or Inter class. Each train should have at least a female

guard attached to it. He did not find that the police gave much help to passengers. He suggested the use of corridor trains.

Khan Bahadur Mohibuddin Ahmad mentioned that on the Chaparmukh-Silghat Railway there were no telegraph or telephone arrangements in some stations. Also there was no fencing at the level crossings even at the crossings in Nowgong Town.

Bihar.

Messrs. Gurmukh Raz Radha Krishna suggested an increase in the number of trains to avoid overcrowding.

Babu Debi Pershad Dhandania considered that in all passenger trains there should be an officer not below the rank of an Assistant Station Master whose duty would be to travel third class with the passengers for the purpose of checking railway coolies thrusting passengers into compartments in excess of their capacity and for the purpose of preventing passengers from entering crowded compartments. In cases when the train became full the station staff should wire to the next station asking them to restrict booking and the Station Master should see personally to the matter. The opening into Passenger Halls should always be guarded.

Benâres.

Mr. Abkoy Ram Chunilal mentioned that the overcrowding in trains facilitated the commission of thefts.

Mr. Bishehar Prasad suggested that a Lady Inspector of some education should travel with every train until female education spread in the country and Indian ladies were able to look after themselves.

Mr. Gauri Sankar Prasad suggested that the 3rd and Inter class carriage doors should be so constructed as to open inwards where they were not so made now.

Nagpur.

The Nagpur Merchants' Association stated that passenger trains were overcrowded for want of sufficient accommodation which resulted in injuries to person and property. No 3rd class compartments should be reserved for any class. There were too many luggage-vans sent on trains which reduced the number of compartments available for passengers. He had seen cases in which thefts had occurred owing to great overcrowding.

Mr. Heerjeebhoy Hormusjee stated that thefts in carriages generally took place at night. The police on duty in the trains either made themselves comfortable by lying on seats at the cost of the convenience of passengers or at times instead of the police watching the thieves, the thieves would be watching the police and when one of the police left one carriage to enter another, the thieves quietly started their work. There should be inter-communication on all passenger train carriages as was the case with the Bombay-Poona Express, and the police on duty should move throughout the train, thus giving no opportunity to thieves.

Messrs. Keekabhai and Nathani stated that the number of passenger trains should be increased, a limited number of passengers only should be allowed in each compartment and the Railway Company should be held responsible for any mismanagement in this respect.

Mr. Mohamed Yakub stated that sufficient 3rd class trains should be provided. At present passengers were packed without any consideration for safety. Proper police supervision was required.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce suggested that the safety of passengers could be better assured by the provision of more liberal accommodation for the 3rd class, and by train conductors.

The Delhi Piecegoods Association stated that there was no general complaint about the safety, though there was much room for improvement in regard to the comfort of the public which might be brought about by running an increased number of trains and also by having Travelling Inspectors on all classes of trains.

The Delhi Hindusthani Mercantile Association suggested a stricter guard over ladies' compartments and improved arrangements by the police especially in connection with night trains. The present Passenger Superintendents were useless because they were recruited from the military class which was not familiar with common courtesy. Indians of higher social standing should take their place and should submit their reports to the Railway Board and to the Head of the Railway Administration and not to the District Traffic Superintendent. The powers of Station Superintendents as regards Passenger Superintendents should be reduced and the latter should be given more executive power to deal with certain matters on the spot. Traffic Inspectors should more frequently travel at night. Short bookings on fast night trains should be stopped. The crowding of passengers in 3rd class as well as in intermediate class compartments should be stopped.

Lahore.

The Tea Traders' Association, Amritsar, suggested that better paid, more experienced and a better class of men should be appointed as police train guards.

Messrs. Diwan Chand and Sons, Piecegoods Merchants, Amritsar, thought that in all passenger trains there should be 2 policemen to guard passengers, particularly during the night; they should sit in the carriage next to the carriage reserved for 'Ladies'. At all halting stations they should go round the train and see that everything was in order. The presence of these policemen in running trains would greatly contribute to the safety of passengers and would be a check on the activities of bad characters. There should be a separate reserved compartment for Police travelling on night trains. Police should travel not only on mail trains but also on all passenger trains.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyallpur, suggested that off sides of trains should be watched at stopping stations particularly carriages reserved for ladies, as robbers and thieves took advantage of the lack of supervision over the railway station staff.

Sheikh Muhammad, Managing Proprietor, Colony Flour Mills, Lyallpur, was of opinion that more policemen should travel on trains.

Cawnpore.

The United Provinces Central Mills suggested that responsible officials should be appointed to travel with trains to look after the interests of passengers and one man should be posted at each booking office, where many ignorant 3rd class passengers were robbed.

The Tribeni Desi Sugar Works, Allahabad, suggested that corridor trains should be started. The classes, however, should be separated. There should be no connection between the female carriages and other carriages.

The Naini Glass Works, Allahabad, suggested that a responsible official independent of the railway administration should travel with every train, whose duty should be to look after the comforts of passengers and to report to Government all complaints against railway officials. The law as to the limit of passengers each compartment should legally hold should be strictly observed and the railway company and its officials committing any breach should be prosecuted.

Messrs. B. N. Rama & Co., Allahabad, agreed entirely with the suggestions made by the Naini Glass Works, Allahabad. They added that passengers found much difficulty in purchasing tickets. The ticket office was opened only for 10 or 15 minutes before the arrival of a train. Passengers should be allowed to purchase their tickets at least half an hour before. At present there was a great crowd which led to a certain amount of corruption. The booking clerks refused to give tickets on the plea that they had not got change. There were also opportunities for pick-pockets, etc., who were in league with the Police who obtained a share of their spoil. Men left their luggage, went off to purchase tickets and on their return found that their luggage was gone. There were also complaints that tickets were given to stations short of destination to illiterate passengers. All these malpractices happened because the booking office was not continuously open. There were also complaints from passengers that they were not allowed on the platform until the train came in when there was a great rush of passengers, children were knocked down, women were insulted, etc. Only that morning at Cawnpore their representative had found that the booking office was closed and police constables were giving tickets to the people in return for a consideration. The booking office was only opened 20 minutes before the arrival of the train. There should be Railway Police at every station. Where there were no Railway Police, passengers who lay about waiting for trains were not properly protected against thieves and pick-pockets.

Mr. S. M. Bose, Merchant, Cawnpore, stated that there was a system on the East Indian Railway of bolting the doors, but guards would only give them if a lady was travelling and wanted it. He had often found that he had to travel alone in a first class compartment at night and in his opinion the privilege should also be extended to gentlemen.

Question No. 13.—Do you consider that the treatment and investigation of claims is satisfactory? Is there any special complaint as to particular classes of claims? Are claims promptly dealt with?

Bombay.

Messrs. Ralli Brothers considered that matters were generally satisfactory. Claims were not dealt with as promptly as consignees expected, which was probably due to the routine followed by railways. They suggested that the Conference Rule on the subject should be strictly adhered to.

The Bombay Chamber of Commerce thought that matters were not entirely satisfactory because railways to a very large extent adopted the principle that the goods had been stolen and pilfered in running trains and that it was the duty of firms to establish that this was not so. In about 80 per cent. of cases claims were repudiated on this ground. Firms desired to be

more certain that the thefts were committed from running trains. The wording of the risk note required alteration. The present one gave very little protection to owners. Claims were as promptly dealt with as could be expected from a semi-official department. Another excuse adopted by railways was that thefts were due to causes beyond their control which was a very difficult argument for merchants to refute.

Messrs. Phillips and Company stated that they generally received compensation from the railway for pilferages or thefts but only after much correspondence and delay. They produced the papers of a case extending over 10 months.

The Bombay Presidency Trades Association thought that the chief difficulty before the trader was the question of liability. The customer thought that that should fall on the trader and so did the railway. Both should realize that the trader's liability ceased once the consignment was made over to the railway. Railways rejected claims on inadequate grounds. The Association cited the instance of a case of whisky being sent to an officer who had left his station before it arrived. After some time the railway wrote and informed the consigning firm that the case had not been delivered as there was no trace of the consignee and stated that unless steps were taken for the case to be returned the articles would be sold by the railway. The railway charged demurrage. The firm replied that the delay was not due to their negligence. Correspondence continued until finally intimation was received that the case had been sold and the proceeds credited to the railway.

The Grain Merchants' Association thought that the treatment and investigation of claims was highly unsatisfactory. Notices for all claims had to be served upon the Agent while the investigation and settlement rested with the General Traffic Manager or Goods Superintendent. As these officers settled claims merchants generally gave notice to them. These officers after three or four months replied that the matter was under enquiry. As soon as the notice time of six months was over merchants were informed that their claims were barred as notice had not been received by the Agent. If risk notes had been taken by the railway the claimant received a curt reply that his claim could not be entertained as Risk Note B or H had been executed. Delay in the settlement of claims was habitual with Companies. The shifting of the responsibility on to other railways was also resorted to.

The Bombay Marwari Chamber of Commerce complained of great delay in the settlement of claims.

The Central India Spinning, Weaving and Manufacturing Company, Limited, of Nagpur, stated that the treatment and investigation of claims was not satisfactory. Claims in respect of the loss of whole packages were not dealt with equitably. Railways disallowed such claims without giving the aggrieved party any information as to how the loss was occasioned, generally taking shelter under the terms of the Risk Note Form B, which absolved them from all responsibility. Claims were not dealt with promptly.

Messrs. Tata Sons, Limited, considered that railways acted in a highhanded and arbitrary manner in the treatment and investigation of claims. Months generally elapsed before the stereotyped reply was obtained that the matter was receiving attention. Claims remained pending for as long as a year. When a claim was repudiated the only answer given was that the railway was not liable, the goods being consigned at owner's risk. No particulars were even given as to the investigation made and no copy of the police report was ever sent for information. It was most unfair that railways should merely repudiate liability without even giving an explanation as to where or how the goods were lost. Once goods were delivered to the railway consignors did not know how the consignment was carried or what precautions were taken for its safety, but in a suit the consignor was expected to prove the negligence of the railways without any facts in his possession.

The Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau said that the treatment and investigation of claims was not satisfactory. Indifference was manifested towards complaints and long delays occurred before they were disposed of. At times, no replies, except bare acknowledgments, were received.

The Bombay Native Piece-goods Merchants' Association, stated that matters were not satisfactory; claims took several months to settle. They suggested that small committees of officials and non-officials should be appointed to deal with and settle claims.

Madras.

The Madras Chamber of Commerce had no complaints.

The Madras Trades Association also had no complaints. They realized that the railways had to be satisfied as to the validity of claims and that the enquiry on this point must take time.

The Madras Piece-goods Merchants' Association said that railways did not enquire so carefully into cases of consignments booked at owner's risk. For claims generally "years are generally required for settlement." There was great delay in dealing with owner's risk cases. "We think that a period should be fixed and that all claims not rejected within that period should be paid."

The Rice, Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association said that matters were unsatisfactory so much so that on account of the inconvenience caused many passengers did not claim at all.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce cited instances of claims which were not settled for two years. Where consignments at railway risk were concerned the enquiry was quicker. There should be a special staff to deal with claims. Inspectors should visit complainants to get details. There should be a binding time limit of three months unless the complainant had failed to produce the necessary evidence. There should be definite rules as to the evidence to be produced.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce said that the treatment and investigation of claims was not satisfactory. The railway took advantage of the risk note. Running train theft was the retort generally given by the railway when a claim for shortage was presented to them. The railway ought to prove that it was a case of running train theft and should not put the onus on to the consignor. In some cases settlement of claims was not finished until 8 or 9 months had elapsed. They suggested the appointment of a special officer to go into claims with a panchayat.

Mr. Rose, Manager of the Bank of Mysore, thought that to anyone laying himself out for thieving the words "O. R." were a sufficient invitation to plunder the contents of the particular parcel booked on such terms. The railway company could well afford to take the entire risk for all shipments by the enhancement of a small graduated fee for insurance or by the actual increase of the present freight charges to a small extent. If the Post Office could afford to make insurance of valuable parcels and letters sufficiently profitable at $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and safe as well, it should not be a difficult matter for the railway company to become their own insurers or to act in conjunction with well-established Insurance Companies conducting burglary insurance business.

Mr. Raja Rao, Claims Agent, said that the present risk note system was defective because the railway took shelter under the risk note when a claim for shortage was made. Risk notes should be so modified as to guard the interests of merchants.

Mr. Noor Mohammad, Merchant, urged that the risk note system should be abolished.

Calcutta.

The Bengal National Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that there should be a special department of the railway to make enquiries into claims which should be assisted by a committee consisting of railway officials and other public bodies. The Eastern Bengal Railway had appointed an Advisory Committee but it only sat once a quarter and then only for about an hour-and-a-half, so that there was very little time left to enquire into complaints.

The Calcutta Trades Association mentioned that there were general complaints as to the treatment and investigation of claims, especially where consignments had travelled over a foreign line. In such instances claims were referred back to the foreign railway concerned, the result being great delay. They cited three instances.

The Import Trade Association was also of opinion that there was too much delay. They suggested that claims cases should be put into the hands of one man as was done in the Telegraph Department or the Postal Department which sent men to enquire at merchants' offices. The attitude of the railway was to repudiate claims on technical grounds as much as they possibly could. A favourite method of repudiating a claim was by saying that the railway was not responsible for running train thefts and the Association contended that it was as much incumbent upon the railway, as upon the consignor, to prove that the case was one of theft from a running train.

The Marwari Association thought that claims were not promptly dealt with. Complaints were acknowledged and it was stated that the matter was receiving attention but nothing further ever happened.

The Bengal Mahajan Sabha agreed. They suggested that if goods were placed in charge of the railway they ought to be responsible for them, but they avoided responsibility under the risk note forms. Then there was the question of running train thefts. When a consignment which was carried over several railways disappeared, the railways were not in a position to know where that consignment had actually disappeared. The result was that the railways declared that it was a case of running train theft and the onus was upon the merchant to prove negligence on the part of the railway which was quite impossible. Further, it was difficult to know how the railway ascertained that it was a case of running train theft.

Messrs. Morarji Anandji stated that the onus of proof which had hitherto been cast upon the consignee in the case of running train thefts should be shifted from them to the railway. Further, previously the railway authorities waived claims for pilferages from bales on the strength of Risk Note B or H, but had paid claims for shortages of entire packages; but recently they had been repudiating even such claims on the strength of the risk notes.

The Wine, Spirit and Beer Association said that one of their complaints was that when a claim was brought against a railway the claimant was informed that he had not done something which he ought to have done. The railway always tried to shirk responsibility. There were many cases of long delay. They cited one pending from June 1920, another from 29th

October 1920 and a third from 2nd December 1920. In many cases when meeting claims the railway said that they were not admissible as a clear receipt was given. Again the railways would have nothing to do with breakages. They refused to admit that it was possible for a railway coolie to hold a case advantageously and bang it on the ground thereby securing the contents through breakage. They said that they were not responsible for anything wrong inside the package so long as the outward appearance of the package was good. The Association had been fighting the Railway Board on this question but they refused to have anything to do with it. The Association was of opinion that there were far more breakages on Indian Railways than there were in marine transport and cited an instance of a consignment of 150 cases of whisky received from Glasgow in which only two bottles were broken. The loss of one firm, Messrs. Cutler Palmer and Company in beer alone during 1920 amounted to Rs. 2,000. The Association was of opinion that the damages and breakages that occurred were mostly the work of railway officials and were committed deliberately for their own benefit.

The Tata Iron and Steel Company, Limited, Jamshedpur, stated that if a claim could be resisted on a technical ground it received less attention than it should. Railways did not pay enough attention to the criminal aspect of the cases. Possibly the Claims Branch might be made independent of the Traffic Department. There were no complaints about delay in settlement. Merchants did not complain because they knew that they would get nothing and also because articles could not be identified. They accepted their losses as a part of the ordinary risks of railway traffic.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that the treatment and investigation of claims was on the whole satisfactory. Long delays occasionally occurred more especially when the River Steamer Companies were involved. The Chamber also mentioned the case of running train thefts. When a shortage was detected from a wagon and an enquiry was asked for, the claim was sent up to the Claims Department of the Railway, who replied on a type-written form that the case would be dealt with in due course. After some time a reminder would be sent, the reply to which would be that the claim could not be entertained as it was a case of running train theft. The report of the police would be called for as it was probably not a case of running train theft, but the Chamber could not get any further. The Chamber had found that the Steamer authorities were more generous and reasonable in the treatment of claims and did not appear to be tied down by their rules.

The Narayanganj Chamber of Commerce considered that the treatment and investigation of claims was generally satisfactory, but claims might be more expeditiously dealt with.

The Indian Merchants' Association did not consider that the treatment and investigation of claims was satisfactory, especially in small consignments, as for instance bazar baskets and other commodities of every day use. Claims were often overlooked by the Railway Company. The Association had found that the railways generally refused to pay claims if the consignment was booked at owner's risk. Claims were not promptly dealt with.

The Chittagong Traders' Association did not consider that the treatment and investigation of claims was satisfactory. Claims for baskets containing fruit and vegetables were never entertained. The claims were not promptly dealt with and occasionally delayed for an undue length of time.

Assam.

The Surma Valley Branch of Indian Tea Association stated that they had only one case in which the railway had evaded a claim on the ground of running train theft. The onus of proof that it was a running train theft fell on the public. They had never had access to the police report in such cases.

Rai Sahab Manmohan Lahiri did not consider that the treatment and investigation of claims was satisfactory. Claims were not promptly dealt with.

Khan Bahadur Mahibuddin Ahmed stated that the general opinion of traders was that the treatment and investigation of claims was not satisfactory and claims were not promptly dealt with.

Babu Ramani Mohan Das said that there was delay in the settlement of claims. Most people did not make claims because they did not wish to be bothered.

Bihar.

The Bihar Planters' Association stated that the investigation of claims was generally very dilatory and it was many months before they were settled.

Messrs. Gurmukh Rai Radha Krishna did not consider that the treatment and investigation of claims were satisfactory. Claims were not properly dealt with. They cited an instance which occurred in November 1919 when they imported some milch cows and calves from Delhi for their dairy. They were costly animals and the wagons should have been detached at Patna Junction, but they were carried on to Howrah where the cattle were kept without food for some days and were ruined. A claim was lodged but it was not even acknowledged.

Babu Deli Pershad Dhandunia did not consider that the treatment and investigation of claims were satisfactory. There was unnecessary delay in dealing with cases. After much correspondence the Traffic Inspector took up the enquiry which however was not carried out in a satisfactory manner.

Benares.

Mr. B. P. Haldar stated that claims were investigated promptly but were generally repudiated.

Mr. Mohammad Ikram Khan did not consider that the treatment and investigation was at all satisfactory—especially on the East Indian Railway and the Bengal and North-Western Railway. Witness produced the file of a case in which a claim was made by his firm on the 21st January 1920. Reminders were sent in April and in October. No reply was received till November when the Bengal and North-Western Railway repudiated the claim and referred the firm to the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway. There was no official at Moghulserai or Benares who had power to deal with small claims.

Mr. S. C. Mukerjee did not consider that the treatment and investigation of claims were satisfactory. Claims were never admitted in the case of edibles and perishable goods.

Mr. Jaydayal Madan Gopal mentioned the case of a consignment of 21 bales of cloth received from Bombay in which 29 *thans* were short. Complaint was lodged and reply was received that an enquiry was being held. Later another letter was addressed to the railway to which the reply was received that no trace of the stuff could be found. The stuff was booked at owner's risk and the railway were therefore not liable. In another case 2 bales of cloth booked at railway risk were received from Calcutta; about 20 pairs of *dhotis* were found short at destination. The matter was referred to the railway who replied that the bales were not opened on railway premises and therefore the receiving station was not responsible for the loss. The forwarding station should be addressed in the matter. The loss in this case was about Rs. 100. In this case the freight was found to be less at the destination station and he was charged some excess rate. Apparently the goods were undercharged at the booking station.

Mr. S. C. Mullick cited a case which occurred in May 1920 in which 5 drums of linseed oil were despatched from Howrah to Benares but had not yet arrived. The case was referred to the Traffic Manager, Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, Lucknow. Two registered letters were sent without any reply being received from the railway. Eventually the matter was referred to the Agent who replied that the matter was still under enquiry, but up to date no reply had been received. From his experience it sometimes took more than 2 years for a single claim to be settled. He thought that this was largely due to the fact that the staff was inadequate.

Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammad Siddiqe considered that the treatment and investigation of claims were not satisfactory. Merchants generally received a reply from the Railway Company that goods were pilfered in running trains and that nothing further could be done. Claims were not promptly dealt with.

Mr. Bisheshwar Prasad stated that the treatment and investigation of claims were far from satisfactory. There was inordinate delay in the settlement of claims and he had known cases in which settlement had not been effected, in 6 or 7 months.

Mr. Murlidhar Kaluram mentioned that claims were promptly settled as a rule in the case of the East Indian Railway and the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway but in the case of the Bengal and North-Western Railway they were not settled even after the lapse of more than a year.

Mr. Gauri Shankar Prasad mentioned that in outlying stations the poorer merchants wrote out complaints and addressed them to the District Traffic Superintendent or Traffic Managers. When no relief was obtained they went to vakils for further advice, when they learnt that the time limit of six months had elapsed or that the complaint was not made to the proper officer or to the proper railway.

Nagpur.

The Nagpur Merchants' Association stated that the treatment and investigation of claims were unsatisfactory. There was seldom any investigation in the first place and if ever one was held it was done behind the backs of the complainants.

Mr. Sorabji Mehta said that the treatment and investigation of claims were not satisfactory. These remarks applied with greater force to claims in respect of the loss of whole packages which were disallowed without the aggrieved party being given any information as to how the loss was occasioned, the railway generally taking shelter under the terms of the Risk Note Form B which absolved them from all responsibility. Claims were not promptly dealt with.

Mr. Heerjeebhoy Hormusjee stated that the treatment and investigation of all kinds of claims in general were not satisfactory. Investigation entailed an unreasonable length of time and eventually claims were not entertained. The germ from which all complaints

against the railway companies sprang lay hidden in the device of the so-called risk-note forms. Special concession rates were offered to the public on the one hand, and on the other a binding agreement was taken from them to hold the railway company free from any responsibility in the case of damage or loss. Risk note forms were the mightiest weapons given into the hands of the railway companies whereby to oppose any kind of claim. He did not think that the railways carried the goods under any special escort or that the railways were in any way materially benefitted by this device which only provided the servants of the railway companies with a licence to be careless and unmindful of the loss to the public. In addition they had the confidence that their actions would not be noticed so long as they did not place any responsibility on the company. In the case of wilful neglect on the part of railway servants the burden of proving such neglect was thrown on the person alleging neglect. Thieves stealing goods carried by the railway companies under the Risk Note escaped and there was no remedy left to the public who were tempted by the owner's risk note rates. There should be a change in the railway legislation already existing which provided railway servants with opportunities for pilferage.

Messrs. Keekabhai and Nathani stated that railway officials did not investigate cases of claims for property stolen. Hence thefts were not detected.

Mr. Mohamed Yakub mentioned that claims were not properly dealt with and on one occasion it took 12 months before one of his claims was settled.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce stated that the settlement of claims was most unsatisfactory. There was great reluctance on the part of railways to entertain them and settlement was very dilatory. It was quite usual for claims to pend for months. The reasons given by the railway authorities when refusing to entertain claims were: (1) the fact that the goods had been handed over on a clear receipt. Frequently merchants could not detect shortages until they had taken delivery of consignments and had opened the packages; (2) that the claims were time-barred. Claims were sent in by merchants to the wrong officials. The railway authorities put off the settlement of the claim until the six months' time limit had elapsed and then told the merchants that the claims were time-barred. This was a very feeble excuse.

The Delhi Piece-goods Association stated that there was a general complaint that claims were not dealt with promptly and that the method of investigation was long and cumbersome and in some cases crafty. For instance, a consignee when he lodged a claim was generally told to refer the matter to the District Traffic Superintendent, who instead of referring the complainant at once to the Agent for registration of his claim would open up the usual correspondence that the claim was being investigated. Months passed away and after six months he would be told that his claim was time-barred. In some cases it took about a year to get any redress and often this was not obtained until legal proceedings were threatened. The public did not generally know whom to approach for the settlement of their claims and did not know that they must register their claims within six months.

The Delhi Hindusthani Mercantile Association stated that the attitude of the railways in India, especially of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway and Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway in the settlement of claims was unsatisfactory. Railways invariably endeavoured to repudiate claims. Correspondence with claimants was intentionally neglected. Unnecessary questions were put to claimants and great advantage was taken of vagueness of expression on the part of the claimant. There was no one in Delhi who could settle claims. Merchants had to pass through a long routine.

Major Ruehl, Commandant B. Company Supply Depot, Ambala, stated that formerly claims were paid provided whole packages were lost. Latterly even if the pilferage amounted to 50 per cent. the railway would not pay. Railways stated that they were responsible for the loss of whole packages provided that the loss was not due to theft from running trains. Railways should prove to merchants or consignors that the package was taken from a running train and did not occur in the transshipment yard.

Lahore.

The Tea Traders' Association, Amritsar, thought that the treatment and investigation of claims were unsatisfactory. They cited a case where 144 chests of tea were despatched from Calcutta to Chaman on the 10th of February 1919, 5 of which were apparently stolen from a running train for which the Company made a claim, but received no satisfaction for more than a year. Recently the Railway Company had offered to deliver the 5 chests in question. On the firm writing that the tea had deteriorated in quality for being kept for such a long time and that the invoice value of the consignment should be paid, the District Traffic Superintendent replied that the claim could not be entertained. In another case 71 chests of tea were despatched from Carnac Bridge, Bombay, on the 17th March 1920 at railway risk; the chests arrived in broken condition and 133 lbs. of tea were found short which was duly written in the railway receipt book. A claim was lodged for the price of tea on the 25th April. Eleven months had elapsed but the claim had not yet been settled.

Messrs. Diwan Chand and Sons, Piece-goods Merchants, Amritsar, stated that the treatment and investigation of claims were not satisfactory, much delay being generally experienced. They suggested that claims should be settled within three months. If claims were not settled within that period interest at 6 per cent. should be paid from the expiry of that time till payment of the claims was made. Such an arrangement would accelerate early settlement. The Conference Rule was that claims should be settled within two months, but they would give the railway three months' time because they had to make enquiries from sending stations and consignors. The reason for their suggestion about interest was that consignors only received the cost price of the goods when making a claim. If, however, a claim were not settled for a year their money was lying without interest for that period.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyallpur, did not think that the treatment and investigation of claims were satisfactory. Railway authorities did not interest themselves in claims for consignments sent at owner's risk. When they were deliberately stolen or arrived short for some other reason, cases were not promptly dealt with. The majority of persons being illiterate dropped their cases in order to avoid trouble and expense.

The Indian Merchants' Association, Lyallpur, stated that the present system of investigation was unsatisfactory. Much time was wasted in correspondence. Illiterate claimants, who were the majority, dropped their cases in order to avoid further trouble.

Sheikh Mohammad, Managing Proprietor, Colony Flour Mills, Lyallpur, did not consider that the treatment and investigation of claims were satisfactory. "Justice is very expensive and cannot be had except by lengthy correspondence for a period of years and persistence which is impossible for most claimants."

Cawnpore.

The Upper India Chamber of Commerce, Cawnpore, stated that the treatment and investigation of claims were not satisfactory. This remark applied to all classes of claims. Claims were not dealt with promptly.

The British India Corporation Limited, Cawnpore, said that they had a number of outstanding cases, some of which dated back to 1915. Ordinary cases for compensation in respect of theft on the railway were rarely settled within a year.

The United Provinces Central Mills, Cawnpore, stated that claims hung on for long periods unsettled. They supposed it was due to railways not being equipped with sufficient staff.

Lala Sanwal Das Khanna, Allahabad, stated that the treatment of complaints was most unsatisfactory. Letters and reminders only brought the answer that they were receiving attention. Only when legal steps were threatened did the matter receive full consideration.

Messrs. Rameshwar Prasad, Keshar Prasad, stated that the treatment and investigation of claims were not satisfactory. The railways invariably tried to evade responsibility on technical grounds. They did not refer to any particular case, but had found that in general claims were not satisfactorily dealt with.

The Tribeni Desi Sugar Works, Allahabad, stated that the treatment and investigation of claims were not satisfactory. There had been many cases in which settlement had been delayed. The North-Western Railway and Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway were particular offenders in this respect. When a claim was submitted they replied that they could not pay it because the consignment was sent at owner's risk. The East Indian Railway was willing to pay claims even though the consignment was sent at owner's risk, and even for the loss of a complete package. In such cases also, the North-Western Railway would not pay anything. They pleaded that the consignment was stolen from a running train. The company suggested an alteration in the law by which the Railway Company should be made liable whether the consignment was booked at owner's risk or the theft had occurred from a running train.

The Naini Glass Works, Allahabad, stated that the treatment and investigation of claims were very unsatisfactory, and they were not promptly dealt with. The Railway Company tried to delay claims as much as they could, in order to make the claim time-barred. When a claim was sent, the only reply which the railway administration gave was that the matter was receiving attention and to every reminder the same reply was sent, and in this way, the case dragged on for months.

Messrs. B. N. Rama and Company, Allahabad, stated that the system now in force on the East Indian Railway for the last two or three months for adjusting claims at destination was satisfactory.

Mr. S. M. Bose, Merchant, considered that the treatment and investigation of claims was satisfactory. He had no special complaint of any particular class of claims and had found that claims were promptly dealt with.

Simla.

Major Gwynn, Assistant Controller of Contracts, Simla, stated that the investigation and treatment of claims were most unsatisfactory, and his remarks applied to all classes of claims.

made by and on behalf of his office. He cited four instances:—(1) Three thousands gallons of motor oil were despatched in 225 8-gallon cases and 240 5-gallon drums from Cannac Bridge to Lahore Cantonment East. R/R B/I. 14712, dated 29th April 1920, wagon No. 17614, by C. C. Wakefield & Co., Bombay, to the Officer Commanding "B" Supply Depot Company, Lahore. This consignment had been missing for one year and the railway enquiries were not yet complete. The Traffic Manager (Claims, North-Western Railway, Lahore, stated in his letter No. 16677/20, Car. of 21th February 1921 to Assistant Controller (Oils and Paints), Bombay, that the enquiry was still being made. An express letter was despatched to the Agent, North-Western Railway, on 11th April 1921. (2) Two cases containing 100 lbs. each of Shellac Orange valued at Rs. 617-14, out of a consignment of *Lease-Dum Dum* to Grant Road Depot, Bombay Port Trust Railway, Bombay, R/R Y-4:416, dated 26th August 1920, invoice No. 1 consigned by the Superintendent, Ammunition Factory, Dum Dum, to the Assistant Controller (Oils and Paints), Bombay, had been missing nearly eight months. The Bombay Port Trust railway in their letter dated 9th April 1921, repudiated the claim, as the consignment was booked at owner's risk and charged at military concession rate. (3) Four casks containing 150 gallons each of *ex-Kulti*, East Indian Railway, to Ferozepore Cantonment, R/R No. 50192, dated 13th December 1918, consigned by the Bengal Iron and Steel Company, to the Chief Ordnance Officer, Arsenal Feroz pore, 145 gallons were lost in transit. After a very lengthy correspondence, first with East Indian Railway and then with the North-Western Railway, the latter railway admitted the claim on 11th December 1920, *i.e.*, two years after the date of despatch. (4) A large consignment of flour and *atta* was despatched from Subzimundi Station, East Indian Railway, Delhi, on the 13th December 1920 to Bombay. Towards the end of the month, the Station Master, Subzimundi, was advised by telegram from Igatpuri and Bombay of a serious shortage from five of the wagons. All the wagons were despatched the same day and the heavy shortages reported left no room for doubt that extensive and organized thefts had occurred. Three of the wagons were checked at Igatputi, and although not stated, there was obviously a reason for this checking *en route*. The matter was immediately taken up with the District Traffic Superintendent, East Indian Railway, Delhi, in his office letter No. 73—35-W. of 4th January 1921, who was requested to report. The Divisional Traffic Manager, East Indian Railway, Cawnpore, in his letter No. C M. I.-27-D. of 30th March 1921, disclaimed responsibility on behalf of the railway because the loading of the wagons was performed by military authorities and not supervised by the railway staff at Subzimundi and that the wagons were sealed by the Military Authorities with their own seals. The Divisional Traffic Manager, Cawnpore, passed the case on the Divisional Traffic Manager, Great Indian Peninsula Railway, Bombay, and the result of the enquiries on that railway was awaited.

Another difficulty experienced with the Railway Company was that owner's risk meant that the railways took no risk, but adduced a number of excuses to cover their action. The following were instances:—"In view of the fact that the goods were carried at reduced owner's risk rates, the railway is not responsible for the loss of the two bags." "The consignment was loaded and the wagon sealed by the sender, and the claim therefore cannot be admitted." The claim cannot be admitted, as the loss occurred through running train theft and as the goods were booked at reduced rate, the railway is exempt from liability. "The consignment was booked 'said-to-contain' and the loading and unloading were performed by the owners." "The consignment was booked at military rates and owner's risk."

He would like to contest the legality of these excuses. The railway had no authority as far as he could make out, for instructing station masters to give "said-to-contain" receipts even when the wagon was loaded by the sender. Where the public had to load at railway stations, the railway authorities had to check and give a clear receipt at the station. He wished to go one step further and ask them to check at mill sidings. There were a number of mills working for Government, most of which had sidings. They were prepared to pay for the railway checking staff, if they could only get a clear receipt. Another point was that the onus of proof lay on the sender, but they could prove nothing. When the railway said it was a case of running train theft, they were not in a position to prove that it was not. The railways themselves did not know exactly where theft occurred, and that was also the difficulty experienced by the senders.

Question No. 14.—Have you any suggestions to make for the improvement of the methods of dealing with claims.

Bombay.

The Grain Merchants' Association suggested that General Traffic Managers and Goods Superintendents should be empowered to accept notices of claims on behalf of Agents. The Claims Officer should have experience of various markets and rates. A definite time should be fixed for the settlement of claims.

The Bombay Marwar Chamber of Commerce suggested that enquiries should be completed within a month at the most after the complaint had been made. A Central Claims Officer should be appointed by Government to whom claimants could resort in the case of long delay and non-payment of claims by railways.

Messrs. Tata Sons, Limited, suggested that investigations should be made more promptly and details should be submitted to the claimant in the case of consignments sent both at owner's and railway risk. Railways should take into consideration the probability of thefts by their own servants and strict precautions should be taken and exemplary punishment inflicted in the case of detection. It should not be assumed that it was a case of running train theft thereby absolving the railway from all liability.

The Bombay Native Piece-goods Merchants' Association suggested the appointment of small committees in the chief cities of officials and non-officials representing various trade interests to deal with and settle claims after they were lodged with the railways.

The Indian Merchants Chamber and Bureau suggested the appointment of small committees in all the principal towns consisting of representatives of the European and Indian Chambers of Commerce and railway officials and representatives of commercial associations might also be appointed.

Madras.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce recommended that a special staff should be constituted for investigating into and disposing of claims and that a binding time limit should be imposed.

The Madras Piece-goods Merchants' Association suggested that a period for the settlement of claims should be fixed and all claims that were not rejected within that period should be paid.

The Rice, Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association were of opinion that there should be a special staff. Inspectors should visit complainants to get details of cases. There should be a binding time limit of three months unless the complainant had failed to produce the necessary evidence.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce would have a special officer to go into claims with a panchayat.

Calcutta.

The Hatkhola Banijya Hitaishini Sabha suggested that the officer in charge of the Claims Department should be versed in the vernacular of the country in order to be able to consult freely with complainants. Claims should be granted in accordance with the retail market price of goods. Complainants generally received compensation at a lower rate than the actual rate.

The Marrari Association suggested that complainants should be taken into confidence and should be kept informed of the progress of enquiries and that the complete result should be communicated to them.

Chittagong.

The Indian Merchants' Association suggested that complaints should be treated in the same way as in the Postal Department. More attention should be given to the grievances of the public. As soon as a complaint was laid, an inspecting officer should see it without loss of time and start an investigation. There should be a time limit within which, if the Railway Company could not get a clue, they should satisfy merchants' claims.

The Chittagong Traders' Association suggested that there should be a time limit within which claims should be decided and satisfied.

Bihar.

Babu Debi Pershad Dhandania thought that the present system of centralization by which the Divisional Traffic Manager's Office at Howrah and Cawnpur dealt with claims was defective resulting in long delays in settlement and replies to letters by claimants and harassment to parties. The District Traffic Superintendent should be empowered to deal with claims relating to his own district and should also be empowered to appoint a Committee, where, in his opinion, it was necessary, consisting of three members, one of them being a railway man and the remaining two being members of the public to deal with delays in connection with any particular complaint. The period of limitation for bringing a suit against Companies should be extended to 3 years.

Benares.

Mr. B. P. Halder suggested that if enquiries were made through the Railway Police claims would be properly settled.

Mr. S. C. Mullick suggested that by reorganising the Claims Section and by increasing the staff and placing responsible men at the head some improvement might be effected.

Mr. Mohammad Jan Mohammad Siddique suggested that if goods were sent at railway risk and rates were decreased, claims would be promptly dealt with.

Mr. Bisheswar Prasad thought that there was no other reason to account for the delay in the settlement of claims except want of staff in the Claims Department which should be remedied.

Nagpur.

The Nagpur Merchants' Association suggested that claims might be made to the Station Master, the Deputy Traffic Manager, or the Traffic Manager according to the amount claimed and these cases should be investigated and treated in the presence of the parties who should be given a chance of producing evidence.

Messrs. Keekabhai and Nathani suggested that when claimants put in a claim the Station Master should hold an enquiry in the presence of a couple of respectable men.

Mr. Mohammad Yakub suggested that claims should be paid on the invoice of the consignee at once.

Delhi.

The Punjab Chamber of Commerce was of opinion that Arbitration Boards should be established for the speedier settlement of claims and disputes between traders and railways. This Board should consist of 3 members. One railway representative, one commercial representative and one independent man, a barrister or a lawyer. The Board would decide the question of actual liability as well as the amount payable. Their functions would be very much wider than those of Surveyors who merely decided the question of quality and the condition of goods according to samples. It would be advisable to limit the claims to be dealt with by Arbitration Boards to a certain amount. Large claims would go to the Civil Courts as usual.

The Delhi Piece-goods Association suggested that the railway authorities at Delhi should depute some responsible officer to examine and report on all claims which should be met within a reasonable time. The present delay in meeting claims was perhaps due to the fact that railways tried to fix the responsibility for the loss on some particular person or persons before adjusting claims; but the public was not concerned with such investigations and it was necessary, when a shortage had been found, that a prompt refund should be made. If a permanent Arbitration Board were established it should consist of one railway man, one commercial man and the third an independent person. This would perhaps be a cheaper method and just as efficacious in dealing with claims as the appointment of a special railway officer as suggested.

The Delhi Hindusthani Mercantile Association suggested that claims should be acknowledged immediately on receipt of a letter. Railway officials should be appointed immediately to meet the claimant and to fix the value of the claims. Petty claims amounting to Rs. 100 should be settled through the local representative of the railway within one month. Enquiries should not be lengthy. Personal interviews would facilitate matters. Claims should be paid in full as far as possible and at market value. The value of claims should be settled by arbitration. Unnecessary correspondence should be avoided. The same procedure should be introduced as was adopted with complaints in the Postal Department. Commercial Associations should be given a fair opportunity to present their claims which should be forwarded at once to the Agent for prompt action. Delhi merchants should receive more attention as they did business to the extent of 25 to 30 crores of rupees. If railways were afraid to accept goods at railway risk merchants would be willing to pay for insurances. What they wanted was safe delivery. In the Claims Department at least one officer should be an Indian: for Indian merchants it was not so easy to see a European officer as an Indian. The position also could better be explained to an Indian officer. European officers could not look after the interests of the public in the same way as an Indian could. Claims Inspectors should visit merchants in the same way as Postal Inspectors did. At present they never came near the public or asked for their assistance, although merchants were only too ready to help them.

Lahore.

The Tea Traders' Association, Amritsar, mentioned that the provincial Communication Board decided sometime ago that a Committee consisting of representatives of all trades should be formed in three places and a railway officer should be nominated by the Agent to co-operate with each Committee. The Committee should meet at appointed intervals and hear complaints and should settle them on the spot if possible. A Committee had been formed at Amritsar, but as the railway member had not so far been nominated by the Agent it had not been able to begin work. The suggested that committees on the same lines should be formed in other places.

Messrs. Diwan Chand and Sons, Piece-goods Merchants, Amritsar, suggested that all claims below Rs. 500 should be dealt with by Station Superintendents who should be assisted by a local board of merchants to see original invoices, examine account books, etc. The claim should be paid as soon as it was substantiated.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyalpur, suggested that all station masters should be advised to check consignments and verify shortages on the spot when a case was filed and that compensation should be paid according to the owner's *beejuck*. The reports by station masters should be sent to the District Traffic Superintendent's Office for his information. Claims should be settled within 90 days.

The Indian Merchants' Association, Lyalpur, suggested that the present Claims Office located in the Traffic Manager's Office, Lahore, should be decentralized and powers entrusted to District Traffic Superintendents.

Sheikh Muhammad, Managing Proprietor, Colony Flour Mills, suggested the formation of commercial boards at commercial centres in each province by whom claims should be promptly dealt with.

Cawnpore.

The Upper Indian Chamber of Commerce, Cawnpore, stated that the defects in the treatment and investigation of claims were probably due to bad organization which again was due to insufficient and inefficient staff. Selected District Traffic Superintendents should be empowered to deal with claims summarily, after investigation, to a reasonable limit, say Rs. 500.

The United Provinces Central Mills, Cawnpore, suggested that a better qualified and more numerous staff would probably improve the existing situation.

Lala Sanwal Das Khanna, Allahabad, stated that the method adopted by the East Indian Railway recently of sending a responsible official every month on a certain fixed date to settle claims for the public had proved satisfactory. The local staff should be instructed to keep accounts ready, so that they might be settled every month.

Messrs. Rameshwar Prasad Kesar Prasad, Lucknow, suggested that a special Claims officer with suitable staff should be appointed by the Railway Board for each railway district, and he should promptly investigate and be empowered to deal with all claims.

The Naini Glass Works, Allahabad, stated that the law on the subject of claims was very unsatisfactory. It should be altered and the railway companies should send prompt and definite replies to complaints. The usual practice of sending printed post cards to a claim and all its reminders should be abolished. It should be impressed on the railway administration that it was their duty to give prompt and definite answers to all claims which were sent to them. The Claims Department at present was in the hands of persons who were neither acquainted with business nor in touch with the public. The Claims Department should be managed by lawyers of standing and position. With reference to the suggestion that *Panchayats* might be employed they were of opinion that under such a system claims would drag on for months. A business man with a knowledge of law would be able to do the work more quickly. If the Claims Department contained officers with commercial and legal experience, the public would probably be satisfied, but they must have an independent man who should be employed by Government.

Messrs. B. N. Rama and Company suggested that all claims should be settled within a month, and a prompt and a definite answer should be sent to claimants as soon as possible.

Question No. 15.—Have you any other suggestions to make germane to the enquiry?

Bombay.

The Bombay Chamber of Commerce suggested that more supervision by superior grades of police officers was required in the yards. The Watch and Ward should be reorganized and given special officers to control it.

Messrs. Tata Sons, Limited, suggested that the wording of the various risk notes be so amended as to make the railway responsible in case of loss or destruction of entire packages no matter how the loss occurred. Only "robbery" from a running train should absolve the railways from their responsibilities and robbery should be defined as "the carrying away of goods openly and by violence by a gang of robbers." Another matter of importance to the public was the question of onus of proof where goods lost were consigned at owner's risk. The railways alone were in possession of all material facts and they must divulge them so that consignor could prove where and how the negligence occurred.

Ahmedabad.

The Mill Owners' Association had not noticed that the public were sending more consignments at railway risk than was formerly the case owing to frequency of thefts.

Madras.

The Southern India Chamber of Commerce recommended the adoption of the police system in vogue on the Nizam's Guaranteed State Railway and considered that the police in British India should be invested with greater and more definite powers to take cognizance of all crimes and offences committed within their observation.

The Rice, Grain and Sugar Merchants' Association supplied statistics furnished by Mr. Janoo Hassan Sait, a member of the Association showing the following losses sustained in importing rice, grain and other seeds by rail during the last two years:—

	Rs.
Losses during 1918-19	17,000
„ „ 1919-20	19,000

The Association was of opinion that the police should be deputed to guard goods trains and goods lying in sheds and yards, that they should be transferred periodically to avoid intimacy with the railway staff and that a detective staff should be appointed to pay surprise visits to stations without the knowledge of the constables or railway staff. The travelling constables travelled in the aerated water compartment and did not look after passengers. They should move about. The police should do more watching and if necessary should be given more powers.

Mysore.

The Mysore Chamber of Commerce made the following suggestions:—

Supervision of the Watch and Ward.—There should be a Watch and Ward Inspector and the whole establishment should be under a separate department. The present system under which the Watch and Ward was under the Traffic Department was not satisfactory because the station master was in charge of the whole station and even if anything wrong were committed by the chowkidars, goods clerks or other railway servants they all were his subordinates.

Personnel of the Watch and Ward.—The Watch and Ward should be men of good physique. Retired Punjabi soldiers were the stamp of men required. The local man was a doubtful quantity as he had friends and relations.

Pay of the Watch and Ward.—Private firms paid about Rs. 25 to their watchmen while the railways paid them only Rs. 14 to Rs. 15, consequently they had to take to pilferage in order to maintain themselves. The Watch and Ward should not be under the Police.

Transfer of the traffic staff.—The subordinate railway officials should be transferred at least once in every two years. *Hamals* employed at all stations, goods and transhipment yards should wear badges and without a badge no cooly should be allowed to enter the premises.

Priority Register.—This was not maintained by a responsible official, but only by an ordinary clerk who arranged that whoever paid him the best got the priority. The Priority Register should be open to the inspection of the public and merchants should undertake to give a deposit of Rs. 5 on every wagon to be confiscated if they were not able to use it. An extract from the Priority Register should be posted every day in the goods sheds for the information of consignors.

Travelling Magistrate.—Such a magistrate should be appointed and be allowed to hold his court even on platforms. The possession upon a person in the goods sheds of anything which he could not satisfactorily account for should be treated as a cognizable offence.

Claims.—A Claims Officer should be appointed to go into the books of merchants who put in claims and should be assisted by a *Panchayat*. The organisation should be a sort of Arbitration Board. The Risk Note system should be abolished. In regard to running train thefts the onus of proof should be placed on the railways.

Mr. Rose, Manager of the Bank of Mysore, said that it was desirable that the local District Traffic Superintendent should make himself well known to the more important merchants and should attend the meetings of Chambers of Commerce with a view to getting information of all kinds from merchants and also to being more sympathetic to their grievances and their suggestions. The prevalence of a co-operative spirit between the merchant and this officer, the station master and the chief goods inspector would go a great way to check local malpractices and be the means of making railway control over goods more popular. The question of railway and civil police jurisdiction was unfortunately one reason against the cessation of thefts as well as the unwillingness of merchants to prosecute thieves when it necessitated their coming to Bangalore to charge the culprit. No merchants could afford to spend his time travelling to and fro and waiting for the purpose of supporting a charge. It would be preferable to have a Travelling Police Magistrate who could visit stations within his radius once a fortnight.

Mr. Venkateswara Aiyer referring to the Watch and Ward, was of opinion that the staff should be independent of the Traffic staff. If a watchman found that a clerk was committing theft he would not at present report the fact to the authorities because the man had to work under the Traffic Department. Station masters or traffic inspectors should have no hand in the appointment of watchmen.

Mr. Raja Rao suggested that the consignee should be given a chance to be present at unloading. The risk note should be altered; $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. might be added to the present rates for insurance. One representative of each Chamber of Commerce should be allowed to attend the Railway Conference. The District Traffic Superintendent should attend meetings of merchants.

Calcutta.

The Bengal National Chamber of Commerce suggested that it should be made known to the public that Priority Registers were kept in railway offices so that merchants might come forward and register their requirements. In the East Indian Railway and the Bengal-Nagpur Railway statements were prepared and sent out every day in which particulars were noted regarding the requirements of wagons. The same procedure should be adopted on all railways.

The Marwari Association observed that 3rd class passengers were the victims of Police oppression in the waiting halls, near the 3rd class booking office and on platforms. Special vigilance should be kept over the conduct of constables by travelling officers in plain clothes.

Chittagong.

The Chittagong Chamber of Commerce pointed out that the Assam-Bengal Railway Police belonged to Assam and were controlled by an Assam Police officer, who resided and spent the larger portion of his time in Chittagong. The Chittagong jetties which belonged to the Assam-Bengal Railway were policed from Assam, while the river and steamers at the jetties were under the control of the Port Commissioners and Bengal Police. More frequent jetty inspections by police officials would be beneficial. The Inspector-General of Assam might inspect the Railway Police Officer at Chittagong rather more frequently.

The Indian Merchants' Association suggested that the Watch and Ward should be a separate department of the railway under better supervision. Regarding the police, they were of opinion that one police system preferably the district system under more responsible officers would work better than different police systems.

Assam.

Khan Bahadur Mohibuddin Ahmed was of opinion that if station masters were permitted to forward complaints to the proper quarter and communicate the result to traders concerned delay might be avoided. He would make it easier to get open delivery.

Rai Bahadur Promode Chandra Dutt suggested that fresh fruit and vegetables should be isolated from other goods and kept in a separate wagon and well secured. Similar steps should be taken with regard to other goods specially liable to pilferage. Station Masters should be required personally to see to the transshipment of goods.

Rai Sahib Manmohan Lahiri observed that railway servants guilty of misconduct were not always punished. In a civil suit for the recovery of jewellery worth about Rs. 700 against a railway which had come to his notice, a railway servant produced certain documents that were evidently forged and the Court found them to be such; but this servant was seen working in the same railway after the disposal of the case. Railway servants dismissed for misconduct by one railway had been seen working in another railway. This practice should cease. Goods were not properly weighed at the time of booking or on giving delivery except in special circumstances. This should be done.

Munshi Reaz Baksh suggested that the railway should send claims to the Traders Committee suggested by him in Question 7 and that the decision of this body should be final and binding on the railway. Some railway officer should plead the case of the railway before this committee.

Bihar.

The Bihar Planters' Association stated that the Railway Police was said to be restricted in its supervision at railway stations between the distant signals and the wired boundaries of railway land. Thefts and other troubles outside such limits devolved upon the District Police. Such restrictions appeared to be unnecessarily hide-bound, and there should be a more workable arrangement which would bring in the District Police and the Criminal Investigation Department. They were of opinion that there were often conspiracies between the Railway Police and the Railway subordinates and that they were responsible for thefts and other crimes taking place. If the Railway and District Police and Criminal Investigation Department as well as the Detective Department collaborated with the railway authorities more than they did at present thefts as well as other crimes would be more frequently detected and satisfactorily dealt with. The collaboration of these departments should be worked out by a conference of officers with a representative from the public to be included. Goods sheds at outlying stations were insufficiently guarded especially at Ghats and changing stations. There did not appear to be sufficient reciprocation between the different lines of railways. They

suggested the appointment of a *liaison* officer who would be the means of bringing the inter-working of railways more in accord. Where two railways were concerned with a particular complaint the blame was put by each of the railways on the other and the location of responsibility became practically impossible. There should be more accord than at present existed between the superior grades of the Police and the Railway staff, and an improvement in this would lead to greater efficiency in the Police. The Superintendent should have constant interviews with the Traffic Officers. The Railway Police should be better paid and recruited from a better class.

Benares.

Mr. Mohammad Ikram Khan suggested that with State Railways merchants could fight out their case up to the Viceroy. Companies merely saw to their own interests and not to the interests of the public.

Mr. Bisheshwer Prasad suggested that in general railways should be State-managed which would tend to their being run more in conformity with public opinion.

Nagpur.

The Indian Merchants' Association suggested that consignees should be informed of the unloading of goods in the godown by the railway in order to avoid unnecessary detention and theft.

Delhi.

The Delhi Hindusthani Mercantile Association suggested that steps should be taken to maintain general discipline among the railway and police staff. The common grievances against the Police should be attended to and remedied as far as possible.

Major Ruell, Commandant, B Company, Supply Depot, Ambala, stated that in six months he had paid Rs. 9,000 more for booking at Railway Risk but had saved Government Rs. 23,000 in losses. Railways should not be able to throw the burden of proof in regard to running train thefts on to claimants.

Lahore.

Messrs. Diwan Chand and Sons, Piece-goods Merchants, Amritsar, suggested that in full wagon-loads where goods were booked at owner's risk the owner should have the option of locking the wagon and money rewards and certificates should be given to Police and Railway officials who detected cases of pilferage, theft, etc.

The Bar Factory Association, Lyallpur, stated that the system of goods booking was unsatisfactory as it was left entirely to the mercy of the railway staff who did what they liked. Consignments were kept at stations for months unbooked and when the turn of a particular consignment arrived it would be overlooked and another consignment would be booked by the consignor paying money to the goods office staff.

Cawnpore.

The Upper India Chamber of Commerce, Cawnpore, stated that the system of Railway Police administration called for a change. In 1914, the Chamber complained of the water-tight system consequent on the fact that the Railway Police were under the Provincial Government. The Chamber had not considered the alternative of a separate system for each railway. They realized that once provincial boundaries were abolished and the railway system was taken as a unit, a great step on the road to Imperialization had been taken. Even under such a system there would be defects, as for instance in investigating a theft case such as was brought to notice in 1914, which went down to Madras. The consignment had passed over several systems. It was quite likely that the same water-tight system might stand in the way. The Great Indian Peninsula Railway might say that the theft happened on the other railway system and that they were satisfied that the consignment left their system all right. Under such a scheme only the position of the "fence" was altered. The bigger the unit, the larger the number of cases that fell within it. The system of taking the railway administration as the unit would, as the example quoted by him had shewn, be incomplete unless there was one head over all the railway systems. Therefore the Chamber preferred a complete system of Imperialization. They realized that the argument had been brought forward that once the Imperial organization was instituted, the Railway Police would get out of touch with the District Police, and that it was impossible for the former to work without the assistance of the latter force. The Chamber had several times had before them the question of the lack of co-operation between the two forces and it was quite conceivable that that aspect would be very largely emphasized by the Imperialization of the Railway Police. The purpose of the commercial public would be met absolutely, in their opinion, by starting a Railway Criminal Investigation Department, and when any important case occurred like the one cited

above, which occurred in 1914, instead of sending off a Sub-Inspector of the Railway *Thana* where it was reported, all that would be necessary would be to report the case by wire to the local Railway Criminal Investigation Department, who would depute a man. "What is wanted is not unity of administration, but unity of investigation."

The British Indian Corporation, Limited, Cawnpore, referred to the difficulties experienced by them in the matter of Police Jurisdiction on the Railway; for instance, if they sent a small consignment from their siding to, say, Benares, and when the bale was taken delivery of a shortage was discovered. The shortage would be reported to the Railway Police at Benares, who would reply that Cawnpore Collectorganj was in Agra Division. An application would be made to the Superintendent, Railway Police, Agra, who would reply that the bale was received by such and such a pilot and sent from Cawnpore Collectorganj the very same day, and that the bale was intact so far as he was concerned. They would then be asked to apply to the Railway Police, Lucknow, and when they did so, they would be informed that no evidence had been produced that the theft had taken place in their section. The reply of the Corporation was that it was all right when the consignment left Collectorganj and that it was not intact at the destination. There was, in fact, no need for the Benares Police, or any Police to refer the case back to the complainants on the ground of jurisdiction. It was waste of time. If the Agra Police thought that it was all right and that enquiries should be made at Lucknow, they might at once refer the matter to Lucknow, instead of writing to the consignor and asking him to do so. There was an important case in 1913, when a bale was sent down to Madras. At Manmad it was detected to have been obviously tampered with. It was, however, allowed to go right through to Madras. Nobody appeared to have taken any notice except the Station Master, Manmad, who wired the previous junction that the bale had been received from them in a slack condition. But the unfortunate consignee was not warned when about to take delivery, and if it had not been that he detected it himself, he would probably have been allowed to take delivery. No attempt appeared to have been made by the authorities to get at the culprit when the theft was first detected. So far as his recollection went, the Railway Police was a provincial organization, so that its activities were confined to a certain limit. The Corporation wished the system to be abolished. At present, the service was like a series of water-tight compartments, and they thought that there should be free communication throughout. When a theft was reported or discovered, the Police should take up the enquiry, and if their particular section was innocent, pass it on to the next section, instead of resting satisfied with having established that nothing occurred to the consignment in their jurisdiction. Time was lost by the other method and the criminal utilized the time so provided in rendering detection difficult. "What we are all after, I take it, is the thief." The consignee's interests should be in the hands of the Police at the receiving station, and those of the consignor, in the hands of the Police at the sending station. When a thief was apprehended, the Railway Police acted very promptly. Recently, the first intimation they got about loss from a consignment was from the Railway Police, Mirzapore, who sent a man specially to see them about the goods in question. In that case the culprit had been caught.

The United Provinces Central Mills, Cawnpore, stated that the public suffered immensely when the railways stopped booking in certain directions without giving sufficient notice. A merchant, for instance, who was purchasing wheat to book to the Punjab; at the time of buying he was fully aware that the particular commodity was being accepted by the railway; but suddenly, perhaps, when he had completed his purchases, he was informed that the booking was stopped indefinitely. In such cases he was not only the loser in the difference of rate that might arise meanwhile, but the idle stock left on his hand also added to the loss. It was, therefore, absolutely essential that sufficient notice should be given to the merchants in writing intimating that the line would be closed from such and such a date for a certain period.

Mr. S. M. Bose, Merchant, Allahabad, stated that the Railway Police should be increased to three or four times its present strength, and there should be more energetic supervision, which should see particularly that the Police subordinates did not get intimate with the Railway staff,

INDEX.

	PAGES.
A	
ACCOMMODATION—	
— in goods sheds	19, 23, 24, 176, 249, 269, 271, 273-276
— in parcel offices	176, 179
B	
BOOKING—	
— of consignments, of merchants, how done	282-285
C	
CAGES—	
moveable — for parcels	16, 27, 145, 194
CENTRAL BUREAU—	
— for railway police	106, 120, 128-130, 134-138
CLAIMS—	
co-operation between railways regarding —	208-211
promptitude in disposal of —	292-299
suggestions for improvements in the methods of dealing with —	299-303
treatment and investigation of —	292-299
CLAIMS BRANCH—	
employment of railway police officers in the — of the Traffic Department	99-102, 226-230, 300
CLEAR RECEIPT—	
pressure brought to give —	
without examination of goods	32, 51, 52, 53, 64, 209, 285-289
CO-OPERATION—	
— between the Railway police and district police in British India and Native States	57-63, 274, 275
— between railways regarding claims	208-211
— between railway staff and police	93-98, 221-226, 304, 305
— of the district police in the investigation of cases occurring within railway limits	110-113
CRIME—	
— on the railways, mostly committed by local thieves	54-57, 204-208
— on the railways, where it mostly occurs	20-24, 54-57, 179-189, 256-259
— on the railways, where it occurs as regards passengers and their luggage and as regards goods	54-57
unreported loss or — on the railway	50-54, 233-235
CURRENCY NOTES—	
registration by railway police of cases of forged — received in stations or in cash offices	49-50
D	
DELIVERY—	
open —	96, 105, 107, 201, 224, 273, 283-288
taking — by merchants, how done	282-285
DETECTIVE STAFF—	
for the railway police	119-124

	PAGES.
F	
FENCING—	
— of goods sheds and train-shed-sheds	17-19, 175-179, 275-277
FINES—	
Imposition of — on the railway way	231-233
FISH—	
pilferages or thefts of —	24-27, 51-52, 189-193, 265, 270
FRUIT—	
pilferages or thefts of —	17, 24-27, 189-193, 265, 270
G	
GUARDS—	
deputation of railway police head constables and constables as passenger train — at night	41-43
deputation of railway police head constables and constables as passenger train — by day	43-49
deputation of railway police head constables and constables as goods train — at night	41-44
liability of railway police to be called on to provide special — in times of unrest, strikes, etc.	138-140
GOODS—	
where crime on the railways occurs as regards —	54-57
fencing and lighing of — sheds	17-19, 175-179, 275-277
H	
HANDLING—	
— contracts... ..	9-17, 20, 34, 64, 87, 143, 165, 166, 168, 170-174
— of goods	9-17, 164-175, 249, 271
(See also Loading.)	
I	
IMPERIALIZATION—	
— of the Railway police	127-133, 236-244
INVESTIGATION—	
— by railway authorities into reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons	195-202
difficulties encountered in railway police —	102-109
registration and — of reports of shortages from wagons with broken seals by the railway police	36-38
rules regarding the — of cases occurring within railway limits	110-113
treatment and — of claims	292-299
INVESTIGATING AGENCY—	
— in railway police	119-124
J	
JURISDICTION—	
rules defining limits of railway police —	113-116

	PAGES.		PAGES.
L		PROTECTIVE PLATES—	
LIGHTING—		— on wagons	269, 271, 273, 275
— of goods sheds and transhipment sheds	1, 17-19, 175-179, 275-277	PUNISHMENT—	
LIQUOR—		— and reward of the railway police	84-85
pilferages or thefts of —————	24-27, 189-195, 257	imposition of fines as — on the railway	231-233
LOADING—			
system of checking goods at time of —	9-17, 164-175	Q	
LOCKING—		QUARTERS—	
— of wagons	9-17, 164-175	provision of ————— for officers and men of the railway police	80-82
LOSS—			
unreported — or crime on the railway	50-54, 233-235	R	
LUGGAGE—		RAILWAY LIMITS—	
pilferage or theft of — booked or unbooked from passenger trains	20-24, 173-180	definition of —————	110-113
where crime on the railway occurs as regards passengers and their —	54-57	opinion on the adequacy of the rules denoting	113-116
		rules regarding the investigation of cases occurring within —————	110-113
M		RAILWAY POLICE—	
MALPRACTICES—		allocation, strength and working of —	85-93
— of railway police subordinates	64-67, 245-248	amalgamation of the — with the district police	127-138, 236-244
— of railway subordinates	64-67, 204, 245-248, 255-289	amalgamation of the — with the railway administration	127-138, 236-244
pressure brought to give clear receipts without examination of goods	32, 51, 52, 53, 64, 285-289	central agency or bureau of — need for	128-130, 134-138, 305-306
MATERIAL—		cognizance by — of pilferages or thefts from goods sheds, transhipment yards, goods trains and passenger trains	20-24, 179-189, 303
thefts of railway —————	180, 184-186	co-operation between — and district police in British India and Native States	57-63
MISSING GOODS—		co-operation between railway staff and —	93-98, 221-226
registration and investigation of reports of shortages and ————— from wagons with broken seals by the railway police	36-38	deputation of — officers to the railway	99-102, 226-230
reports of shortages and ————— from seal-intact wagons how investigated by railway authorities	195-202	detective staffs for the —	119-124
reports of shortages and ————— from seal-intact wagons when made to the police for enquiry	23-34	difficulties encountered in ————— investigations	102-109
		organization of the —	127-138, 236-244
ORGANIZATION—		popularity of service in the —	72-76
— of the railway police	127-138, 236-244	promotion of the —	67-72
OWNER'S RISK—		prosecution of ————— cases	124-127
arrangements made for safety of goods at —	202-204	punishments and rewards of the —	84-85
consignments of merchants when sent at —	259-263	quality of the —	67-72
abolition of — rate advocated	268-275	quarters for the —	80-82
		recruitment of the —	67-72
P		registration and investigation by — of reports of shortages from wagons with broken seals	36-38
PARCELS—		reports of shortages and missing goods from seal-intact wagons when made to the — for enquiry. Investigation of such reports by —	28-34, 195-202
accommodation in — offices	176, 179	rules defining limits of — jurisdiction	113-116
cages for —	16, 27, 145, 194	seal-checking by the —	38-41
PASSENGERS—		training of —	117-119
protection of — and property by deputation of railway police head-constables and constables as passenger train guards at night	44-48	transfers of gazetted officers of the —	77-78
protection of — and property by deputation of railway police head-constables and constables as passenger train guards by day	48-49	transfer of —	67-72, 273, 303
suggestions regarding the safety of —	289-292	unhealthiness of life in the —	82-83
where crime on the railways occurs as regards — and their luggage	54-57	utilization of — for watch and ward duty on goods trains at night	41-44
PILFERAGES—		RAILWAY RISK—	
on the railways	20-27, 179-195, 256-259, 277-281	arrangements made for safety of goods at —	202-204
— how far due to the act or connivance of the railway staff	34-36, 204-208	consignments of merchants when sent at —	259-263
PROCEDURE—		RAILWAY STATIONS—	
uniformity of — desirable	141-144	registration by railway police of cases of forged currency notes received in — or in cash offices	49-50
PROSECUTION—			
— of Railway police cases	124-127		

	PAGES.		PAGES.
REGISTRATION—		T	
— and investigation of reports of shortages from wagons with broken seals by the railway police ...	30-38	THEFTS—	
— of reports of shortages or missing goods from seal-intact wagons by railway police ...	28-34, 195-202	— on the railways ...	20-27, 179, 195, 250-259, 277-281
RESERVES—		— how far due to the act or connivance of the railway staff ...	34-36, 234-208
proposals regarding — in the railway police ...	90-93	TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT—	
REWARDS—		and the watch and ward ...	1-9, 150-164
punishments and — of the railway police ...	84-85	employment of railway police officers in the Claims Branch of the — ...	93-102, 220-224, 300
— for recovery of goods ...	230-231	TRAINING—	
RIVETING—		opinions on a system of special — for officers and men of the railway police ...	117-119
— of wagons ...	9, 16, 167, 172, 175, 250	TRANSFERS—	
S		— of gazetted officers of the railway police ...	77-78
SEAL-CHECKING—		— railway police ...	67-72, 273, 303
— by the railway police where carried out and force allotted ...	9-17, 38-41	TRANSHIPMENT—	
system of — by the railway staff ...	164-175	fencing and lighting of — sheds ...	17-19, 175-179, 275-277
SEALS—		system of checking goods at time of — ...	9-17, 164-175
checking of — by police ...	9-17, 38-41	TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE—	
defects in system of — ...	9-17, 38-41, 164-175	fixed — for the railway police ...	78-80
methods of checking — ...	9-17, 164-175	U	
registration and investigation of reports of shortages from wagons with broken seals by the railway police ...	36-38	UNLOADING—	
system of — ...	164-175	system of checking goods at time of — ...	9-17, 164-175
SHORTAGES—		W	
registration and investigation of reports of — from wagons with broken seals by the railway police ...	36-38	WAGONS—	
reports of — and missing goods from seal-intact wagon how investigated by railway authorities ...	195-202	fastening — ...	9-17, 164-175
reports of — and missing goods from seal-intact wagons when made to the police for enquiry ...	28-34, 195-202	guarding loaded — ...	9-17, 164-175
SIDINGS—		locks for — ...	9-17, 164-175
extension of railway police jurisdiction to private — ...	184, 185	riveting of — ...	9, 16, 167, 172, 175, 250
STRIKES—		sealing — ...	9-17, 164-175
liability of railway police to be called on to provide special guards in times of unrest, strikes, etc. ...	138-140	defects in — ...	11, 269, 271, 273, 275
SUPERINTENDENTS OF RAILWAY POLICE—		WATCH AND WARD—	
distribution of charges of — in India ...	140-141	appointment of — ...	147-150
		castes from which — are drawn ...	150-153
		enquiry as to character of — ...	150-153
		improvement of — ...	153-156
		opinions on system of — ...	1-9, 156-164
		personnel of — ...	1-9, 153-156, 303
		remedies suggested for improvement of — ...	1-9, 153-164
		recruitment of — ...	1-9, 150-153
		reorganization of — ...	1-9, 153-164
		strength of — ...	1-9, 147-150
		supervision of — ...	1-9, 147-150
		Traffic Department and the — ...	1-9, 156-164
		utilization of railway police for — duty on goods trains at night ...	41-44

